This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Digitized by Google

Mason
E. 112.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Miſcellany Numbers;

Relating to the

CONTROVERSIES

About the

Book of Common-Prayer,

EPISCOPAL GOVERNMENT,

THE

Power of the Church

In Ordaining RITES and CEREMONIES, &c.

Defended by Scripture, Reaſon, Antiquity, and the Sentiments of the Learn'deſt Reformers, particularly Mr. *John Calvin.*

By Mr. Robert Calder *Miniſter of the Goſpel.*

I had always a great Reverence for the Biſhops of your Church, to whom I gave inward Reverence, as well as outward Reſpect, and would gladly have ſerved them in ſettling of the Engliſh *Church, and my Judgment is, If we may have ſuch an Hierarchy, in which the Biſhops ſo excel others, that they refuſe not Subjection to* Chriſt, *but would depend upon Him as their only Head, and refer themſelves to Him; in which they ſo preſerve Brotherly Communion among themſelves, that they are united by nothing more than the Truth: In this Caſe I denounce him worthy of all Curſes, who does not obſerve ſuch an Hierarchy with all Reverence and Obedience. And I would to God ſuch a Succeſſion had continued to this Day, it ſhould eaſily have obtained from us the Obedience that it deſerves. I do account the Government by Arch-Biſhops a Moderate Honour, as being within the Compaſs of a Man's Power to execute, which the Pope's pretended Authority is not, and the Ancient Church did appoint Patriarchs and Primates in every Province, as a Bond to unite Biſhops in Concord.*

JOHN CALVIN.

See Numb. 15. P. 59.

His Opinion of the *Engliſh* Book of Common Prayer, in his own Time.

It is worthy your Conſideration who were the Authors of your Liturgy, and what Teſtimonies they gave to it: Dr. Taylor, *a famous Martyr, when it was ſettled by Authority after its Reformation, affirmed,* That it was ſo reformed, and fully perfected, according to the Rules of Chriſtian Religion in every Behalf, that no Chriſtian Conſcience could be offended with any thing therein contained. *And Mr.* Fox *ſays,* It was generally eſteemed as a Work of GOD. *Doubtleſs, theſe prudent and pious Martyrs, that died in Defence of it, were well ſatisfy'd of the Legality and Purity thereof, at leaſt, that there was no manifeſt Impiety in it.*

See Numb. 16. P. 63.

Let not any think me ſo auſtere, or ſtraitlaced, as to forbid a Chriſtian, without any Exception, to accommodate himſelf to the Papiſts in any Ceremony or Obſervance; for it is not my Purpoſe to condemn any thing, but what is clearly Evil, and openly Vitious.

See Numb. 17. P. 78.

EDINBURGH:
Printed in the Year MDCCXIII.

2664 ... 1717 this Book ... Digitized by Google

ADVERTISEMENT.

THat among the many Errata's, the Reader is desired to mend these Words following, viz. In Page 54. about the End, for Except once in one Collect, to read thus, except in the Collects. As also, Page 109, for S. Jerom's Prophecy, read, Jeremiah's Prophecy. And a little after these Words, for the worthy Author of that Age, read, the worthy Author of the Cyprianick Age. And for Pope Damascus, read Damasus. Page 113. Where you read the holding out one M. read by changing M, into S. Again in the last Number, The Nail struck to the Head 2 pag. 54 line, Because the Church of England in her Catechism defines Marriage to be &c. read, defines a Sacrament to be.

Digitized by Google

To the READER.

THE *Hierarchy* and the *Liturgy*, with the *Faſts* and *Feſtivals* of the Church, are the Butt of the Presbyterian Malice, and againſt which they ſpit out their Venome both from Preſs and Pulpit.

I have done my Endeavour in theſe Sheets to ſhow the Lawfulneſs and Neceſſity of theſe Three: For as to Epiſcopacy, I let ſee, That no Age ſince the Apoſtles wanted one Order above another, and that the Primitive Biſhops were *Dioceſians*; tho' a *Dioceſs* makes not a Biſhop, more than a Paroch, Manſe or Stipend, makes a Miniſter. It is as neceſſary then, to have Perſons in the Holy Miniſtry by Apoſtolical Succeſſion and Ordination, as it is to have Water in Baptiſm, and Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt. The old Schiſmaticks, *Donatiſts* and *Novatians*, were moſt ſenſible of the Neceſſity of Apoſtolical Succeſſion, that at any Rate they would have it, and ſtick by it. Yea, the *Preſbyterians* were forced by the *Independents* to run to Apoſtolical Succeſſion for their Ordination, as may be ſeen in their *Jus Divinum Regiminis Eccleſiaſtici*; tho' now they muſt defend themſelves with Independent Arguments againſt the Epiſcopals. And *Sam. Rutherford* avows, that they had their Ordination from *Rome*; but this is ſimply impoſſible for them to prove: For the Church of *Rome* never conferr'd that Power on meer Presbyters to give Orders, tho' it does permit Laymen, in caſe of Neceſſity, to baptiſe; which Learned Proteſtants are againſt. And in the Primitive Times Presbyters never ordain'd; though ſome of the Presbyterian Advocates and Agents moſt impudently alledge, That the firſt Three Centuries were Presbyterian, yet they can never fix upon the Time when this univerſal Change was made through *Europe*, *Aſia*, and *Africa*, from Presbytery to Epiſcopacy: Nay, they cannot prove their Succeſſion from *John Calvin* in *Geneva*, nor from *John Knox* in *Scotland*; yea, we may condeſcend upon Fourſcore Chiefs of Kin in *Scotland*, that are Two or Three Hundreds of Years older than Presbytery. And what a ſad and dangerous Condition muſt that People be in, that live under a Miniſtry which cannot ſeal the Covenant of Grace, or give the Comfort of *Abſolution* to a Penitent? Surely, as the Prophet *Jeremy* ſaith, Chap. 23. 31. *Such a Miniſtry cannot profit the People.*

And as for Common Prayer and Set Forms, which are Doctrinal as well as Devotional, which inform the Judgment as well as they kindle the Affections; I prove, that it is the People's Right to pray with the Miniſter, as well as to ſing with a Precentor: The People are obliged to know themſelves how they worſhip GOD as well as the Miniſter; for they come not to preach but to offer Prayers and Praiſes, which they ſhould know before hand. And it is as unaccountable Sacrilege, to defraud the People of their Right of worſhipping GOD vocally in the Church, as we account it in Papiſts to with-hold the Cup from them in the Euchariſt; for by this politick popular Trick of Extemporiſing, the People are wheedled into groſs Ignorance. A Man may be a *Jeſuit*, *Socinian*, or the groſſeſt of Hereticks, and pray his Opinions to the People and never be diſcovered by them; as one Mr. *Emlin* was lately in *Ireland*, who preach'd in one of the Diſſenting Meeting-Houſes for a long time, but was diſcovered in Converſation, to be a rank *Socinian*, denying the Divinity of the Son of GOD, and never praying to

GOD

Digitized by Google

GOD thro' the Satisfaction, Merits and Mediation of Christ, as our high Priest, and was afterwards prosecuted by the Arch-Bishop of *Dublin* and banished the Kingdom: But let a Man be what he will in his private Opinion, there is no way for him by a Liturgy to vent his Errors, or to cheat the People: And truly when we consider what sad stuff is Preached and Prayed and vented in Catechising (as I have hinted at in my Fourth Number) it is an invincible Argument to let the People understand the necessity of a sound and solid Liturgy, and to oblige the Nobility and Gentry of the Kingdom, to make their Families Nurseries of Piety and Devotion, by the Book of Common-prayer; and in process of time this might bring the Commons, to Knowledge and Solidity, and let them see how far they have been misled by false Teachers, such Teachers as are not afraid to print such Words as these; *That the Lord's Prayer is a loathsome, lifeless, sapless Worship*, as the Author of the *Casuistical Essay* asserts, and an *Engine from Hell to pervert the Gospel of Christ*; yea, the Author doubts not but to get *all that are exercised in Godliness to say with him.* See pag. 318, 320.

As for the *Fasts* and *Festivals*, they are Helps, Hedges and Ornaments in the Church, by which the substantial Points of Religion are Yearly Preached, and the sutable Devotions are put up in an Unity and Uniformity. We know at *Edinburgh*, how Men worship God at *London* and *Dublin:* So that three Kingdoms are like one Paroch Kirk, and one Kirk like one Man, with one Heart and one Mouth Worshipping and Glorifying God.

I am blam'd by some of my own Friends, for using some Invectives against my Adversaries, particularly *Numb.* 4. But when they have read his Answers, and found, that there was not six Lines in nine Sheets of Paper, without either Railing, Scolding, Lying or Pedantry; they told me, he deserved ten times more, but that Satyr, personal Reflections or uncharitable Truths should not proceed or drop from the Pen of an Episcopal Minister; because that was but like the Party we condemn our selves. I took very well with the Reproof, and therefore in my last Number I used not one harsh Expression, but an Advertisement to all Parties to come to my Meeting-house, that I might let Men see with their Eyes from the Books, which we both mentioned, how palpably my Adversary falsified, in the chief Points debated between us. I am ready to renew the same Challenge in any place within the City of *Edinburgh.* I did this to the Conviction of all that came to hear me, but none of my Antagonist's Party came to the Place. I refer it to the Universities, and if they do not find him an impudent Lyar, I shall undergo what Penance they please to impose upon me.

I shall not contend with them in Railing or Lying, but for Truth and Reasoning I shall never yield. And in these my Numbers I make it plain, that I have the best of the Reformers on my side, particularly Mr. *Calvin* for *Episcopacy*, *Liturgy*, *Fasts* and *Festivals* and Church Ceremonies: So that a Church of *England* Man can hardly say more for the Doctrine, Worship and Government of that Church, which Presbyterians daily pray God to confound and overturn. They have all the Sectarians, Deists, Atheists and Republicans on their side; but *if God be with us who can be against us?* It is His Cause we have in Hand, and we need not fear tho' twenty Legions of Devils oppose us.

Digitized by Google

THE

Anti-Counter-Queriſt COUNTER-QUERIED.

To the Reader.

THE Things I take moſt notice of in the *Anti-Counter-Queriſt*, are, His confident Aſſertions: As,

I. *That the Eſtabliſhment of Presbitry is a Fundamental Article in the Union.*

II. *That the Chriſtians of* Conſtantinople *(whoſe Diſſent is upon Principle of Conſcience) would prize the Liberty which Diſſenters in* Scotland *have, who ſeparate only upon Policick.*

III. *That the Act of Union did confirm the ſole Right of Baptizing to the Presbiterian Kirk, and the abuſing of that Ordinance and of Marriage, mov'd the Government to take that Priviledge out of the Hands of the Epiſcopal Clergy.*

IV. *That it is but of late that the Epiſcopals in* Scotland, *claim'd to be of the Church of* England.

V. *That the ſetting up of the Book of Common-Prayer was not ſo much as attempted in the Time of our late Epiſcopacy.*

VI. *His aſſerting the Loyalty of Presbiterians, and the Diſaffection of the Clergy, to the Civil Government.*

VII. *That the perpetuating Epiſcopal Ordination in* Scotland, *does ſupport a Party, who never pretended Conſcience, for ſeparating from the eſtabliſt'd Government and Worſhip.*

The *Anti-Counter-Queriſt* is anſwered by theſe following Counter-Queries.

The FIRST Aſſertion.

That the Eſtabliſhment of Presbytry is a Fundamental Article of the Union.

1*mo.* AS to the Eſtabliſhment of Presbytry, by the Union, it is demanded, Who can interpret the Articles of the Union better than the Parliament it ſelf? Or, who can give the Meaning of the Law better than the Sovereign and the Parliament, when inconvenient Emergencies fall out? Or, was ever the Kirk-Government ſo much as mention'd in the Treaty of the Articles of the Union? Or, did ever the Queen and Parliament intend, that the Eſtabliſhment of Presbitry ſhould be like the Laws of the *Medes* and *Perſians*, that ſhould never alter?

2*do.* Did ever the Sovereign and Parliament intend by the Eſtabliſhment of Presbitry in *Scotland*, that the Queen's Indulgence to the Epiſcopal Clergy, which was before the Union, ſhould be of no Effect? Or, by the Union, is there an arbitrary and illimited Power put in the Hands of Presbitry, to murder Epiſcopacy and the Liturgy, in *Scotland*, but to eſtabliſh it in *England*, where the Presbiterians have a Tolleration? Or that theſe who are Epiſcopally inclin'd in *Scotland*, ſhould not have the Word preach'd and Sacraments adminiſtred by an Epiſcopal Miniſtry? Or that none ſhould baptize the Children of Biſhops, Presbiters, or of Deacons or their Flock, but Presbiterians, who baptize in to a Party, and not in the Principles of the Catholick Church: As alſo, many of them baptize and communicate in the Solemn League and Covenant, which was reſcinded by Parliament, and never yet reviv'd by any Law in this Revolution?

3*tio.* Either the *Queen* and *Parliament* ſecure Prebiterian Government in *Scotland*, becauſe it is of *Divine Right*, or upon the Account of its being a convenient Politick for the Time. If becauſe it is of *Divine Right*, then muſt not *England* conſeſs her Church to be but an Human Conſtitution? If upon a politick Conveniency, then, Can Presbitry claim more than *Jews*, *Turks* and *Pagans* in ſuch Circumſtances? Or, what if that Politick, in proceſs of Time, ſhould be found inconvenient? Is there no Remedy, but ſtill to continue, tho' it were in the Power of Governours to help it? What if Presbiterian Opinions, and the Inclinations of the People, ſhould alter? Is not this a poſſible Suppoſition? And has not the like been ſeen? And what if *Presbitry* be found an inſupportable Grievance to the Nation, as truly it is? Is there no Remedy provided for the Peace of the Kingdoms, ſpecially if they ſee better Things, and are in Conſcience convinc'd that they were in an Error? Or can any Human E-

ſtabliſhment

Digitized by Google

ſtabliſhment make a falſe Kirk to be true, or a wrong Party to be Right? Or what Unity have *Presbiterians* with any National Church in the Chriſtian World? Or what Unity have they among themſelves, except it be in doing Miſchief? For do not not all Men perceive, that no Paroch in Kingdom knows how the Other worſhip God?

4*to.* Did the Union intend (to pleaſe the Presbiterians) to let Epiſcopacy and the Book of Common-Prayer, ſink, die and expire in *Scotland*; or to promote their own Church in any Part of the World except in *Scotland*? If ſo, ought not Presbiterians to get a Declaration from the Britiſh Parliament, that this was the Meaning thereof, before we be oblig'd to believe them? Or is it likely, that the Wiſdom of the Government ſhould favour Presbitry for its ill Nature, and trample upon Epiſcopacy for its good Nature?

5*to.* When *James Stewart*, in his Letter to *Mijn Heer Fagel*, ſays, *That it is againſt the Nature of the Chriſtian Religion, that one Party ſhould have Power to perſecute another: And that it is abſurd to think, that a ſubſequent Parliament cannot diſannul what a former decreed*: May not this plead for the Epiſcopal Clergy now, as well as it did for Papiſts and Presbiterians when King *James* VII. gave both a Tolleration by an Arbitrary Power, againſt the Law of the Land, and when Epiſcopacy was as well eſtabliſhed by Law at that time, as ever Presbitry was at any other time?

6*to.* Can there be a firmer Union betwixt the Two Kingdoms, than there is between Man and Wife, of different Principles and of Religions? And yet may not the Husband notwithſtanding the Matrimonial Ties, curb the Inſolencies of an inſulting Wife? Yea, may he not divorce her, when it is evidently made appear, that ſhe made ſeveral Attempts to cut his Throat, and that purpoſely to get another Husband to her ſelf of her own Opinion and Principles.

6*to.* And is not this the very Caſe of the *Engliſh* Church and the *Scots* Kirk, when it is found by Experience, that Presbyterians are ſworn Enemies to the Hierarchy and the Liturgy? Or why ſhould Toleration in *England*, to Diſſenters, be right, and to *Scots* Diſſenters be wrong? Have they any better Anſwer to to this, than that By-word in *Scotland*, *Hackerton*'s *Cow*; or that in *England*, *The Caſe is alter'd*, ſaid *Ployden*?

7*mo.* Is it not evident, that *Scots* Presbitry intends to give a ſecond Overturn to the Church of *England*, while in *Scotland* they impriſoned Epiſcopal Miniſters who were qualified, and made no Uſe of the Liturgy; when in the mean time, they protected the general Meeting of the Quakers, from the Inſults of the Rabble? Yea, do they not conſtantly preach, and pray, and write againſt it? Did not the Committee of the General Aſſembly make an Act, ordaining all their Incumbents in the Nation to preach it down? And will not theſe Men fight againſt it, if ever it be in their Power? And may we not thank their Weakneſs rather than their Wills, that they are not in in Arms already; for no leſs do they threaten? See Inſtances hereof in the Poſtſcript.

The SECOND Aſſertion.

That the Chriſtians of Conſtantinople, *who diſſent upon a Principle of Conſcience, would prize the Liberty that the Clergy have in* Scotland, *who diſſent but upon Politick.*

With what Confidence or Conſcience can this be aſſerted? Have not the *Chriſtians* of *Conſtantinople*, *Baptiſm*, *Confirmation* and the *Lord's Supper*, from the Patriarch? And have not the Diſſenters in *England* Indulgence to baptize? And has not the Patriarch Power of Ordination, and of perpetuating the Apoſtolical Succeſſion? And is not this the Liberty that is deny'd to the Clergy in *Scotland*? Yea, did not a learned Senator, openly in the College of Juſtice, declare in the Caſe of Mr. *Greenſhileds*, *That an exauctorate Biſhop had no more Power to Ordain, than a common Ballad-Cryer*? Again, whereas it is ſaid, that it is not Conſcience but Politick that makes the Clergy diſſent from their Presbitry: With what Knowledge or Conſcience can this be ſaid, when by the Principles of the *Teſt*, the Clergy, Heretors, and all in publick Truſt, were ſworn to breed their Children therein, and againſt Phanaticiſm as well as againſt Popery? Is not Epiſcopacy ſworn againſt Presbitry by the Teſt, as well as Presbitry is ſworn againſt Epiſcopacy by the Solemn League and Covenant? So then I ask this bold Aſſerter, Whether it was GOD or the Devil told him this? If it was GOD, how can he prove it? If the Devil, who ſhould believe him or the Devil either, who was a Liar frum the Beginning?

The THIRD Aſſertion.

That the Act of Union did confirm the ſole Right of Baptizing to the Presbyterian Kirk.

Is not this in plain Terms to ſay, That no *Biſhop*, *Presbyter*, *Deacon*, or any of their Hearers or Adherent, ſhall have Liberty to baptize or marry their own Children, unleſs

Digitized by Google

unleſs it be with a Presbiterian Teacher? Is it poſſible that a wiſe Proteſtant *Britiſh* Parliament, could mean ſo much by the Union? Would it, for all the Union, put ſuch a Sword in Presbiterians Hands as would cut it's own Throat? Would it cut off it's own Leg to put on a Timber Leg? Muſt the Epiſcopal Party in *Scotland* receive Ordinances from Presbiterians, whom they believe not to be lawful Miniſters? And if ſome ſcandalous Marriages were made by two or three Curats in *Scotland*, what could be the Cauſe of this, but that the Power of Biſhops in depoſing and cenſuring irregular Practices in their Clergy, was reſtrain'd by Presbiterians? And when the Clergy made Complaints to the Advocate and Magiſtrates, (who had Power to puniſh ſuch delinquent Clergymen) this was not taken notice of out of any Compaſſion to the ſcandalous Marriage-Makers, (whoſe Straits reduc'd them to ſuch Shifts) but out of Cunning to uphold the ſcandalous Report on the Clergy in general, and to Stain the whole Epiſcopal Order?

The FOURTH Aſſertion.

That it is but of late that the Epiſcopal Clergy claim'd Communion with the Church of England.

IS not this a notorious Falſhood! For had not the Clergy of *Scotland* their Ordination from *England* in 1662, by Biſhops whoſe Presbiterian Ordination was look'd upon as Invalid, to wit, Mr *Sharp*, *Fairfoul*, *Lighton* and *Hamilton*? And did not the Biſhops of *Scotland* ordain and conſecrat? And did not many of the Clergy conſecrat the Elements by the Book of Common-Prayer? Beſides, did not the Epiſcopal Clergy and Laicks abjure Presbitry with its *Solemn League and Covenant*, and promiſed to breed up their Children in theſe Principles, and ſtill to adhere to that Abjuration.

The FIFTH Aſſertion.

That the Biſhops never ſo much as attempted the Bringing in the Book of Common-prayer when they were in Power.

MAy not Presbiterians be counter-queried upon this Point, thus, Why did they not bring in the Solemn *League* and *Covenant*, when theſe Twenty Years and upwards, they are in Place, and yet preached it up in the Hills againſt King and Laws when they were out of Place? And (as is ſaid) there was Uſe made of the *Liturgy*, and of other Form of ſound Words in it? And now when the Clergy is out of Poſt, is it not lawful for them to be in the Communion of the Church, and to uſe the Service which is againſt no Law, but only againſt Presbiterian Acts of Aſſemblies, to which in Conſcience the Clergy cannot conform by the Principles of the Teſt? Beſides tho' ſomething were defective in former Times, as the Want of a Liturgy, will that ſay, that Things ſhould never be amended, when Occaſion preſents?

The SIXTH Aſſertion.

That Presbytry is well affected to the Civil Government, and the other Party diſſaffected.

IS it not a new World, when Rebels get the Name of Loyaliſts, and Loyaliſts are called Rebels, and yet none of them chang'd in their former Principles? The one profeſſing the Doctrine of paſſive Obedience, and the other the Doctrine of Reſiſtance, for maintaining their Kirk Government? Which of theſe will readily make the beſt and moſt Chriſtian Subject in a Nation? How have ſome of the Clergy been perſecuted who qualified to the Government? How does Presbiterian Loyalty conſiſt with threatning to riſe up in Arms againſt Queen and Parliament? And who will be the Rebels in Caſe they do riſe? And of whom muſt the Queen expect Aſſiſtance in caſe of a Presbyterian Reſiſtance, but of Epiſcopal Subjects? And are theſe the Men who ſhould be trampled on by Presbiterian Tyrany, or *Lenity* as they call it? Ought not ſuch peaceable Subjects have an Indulgence from a Proteſtant Queen by Law, as Presbyterians had from a Popiſh King? And whether is the Memory of *Oliver* the Uſurper more ſavory to theſe Loyaliſts, than the Memory of K. *Charles* the Martyr? And is not the Calf-Head Club a noble Cadet and beautiful Branch of the Presbiterian Family?

The SEVENTH Aſſertion.

That the Perpetuating an Epiſcopal Succeſſion, is but the ſupporting of a Party, that never pretended Conſcience to ſeparate from the eſtabliſhed Government, till of late.

WAs not the Clergy ſworn againſt Presbitry and canonically ſworn to Epiſcopacy? And now ſeeing many of the Clergy and of the Laity are convinced of the Invalidity of Presbiterian Ordination, and of the Abſurdities of their Worſhip, and that no Paroch in the Kingdom knows, how their next Paroch worſhips God, with what

Con-

Digitized by Google

Conſcience can the whole Nation conform to Presbitry? Yea what Loſs might the Chriſtian Religion be at, tho' Presbitry were rooted out of the Earth? Had not Chriſt a Church upon Earth before ever Presbiterian Government was heard of in the World? And ſeeing they lay no Claim to the apoſtolical Succeſſion, and conſequently have no Title to our Saviour's Promiſe: 28 *Matth. Lo I am with you to the End of the World*; With what Confidence ſhould they deſire (by the Union) to be continued as a true Church to the End of the World, when they do not derive their Miniſtry from the Apoſtles? Or can they ſhew for fifteen Hundred Years a Presbiterian National Church in any Part of the World? Or are there not an Hundred Chiefs of Kin in *Scotland*, who are Four Hundred Years elder than Presbiterian Government? Or have the Presbiterians better Arguments for their Antiquity than the learned Mr. *David Williamſon*, who in his Sermon before the Parliament on the 2 *Pſalm* 10. (which he, after Delivery of it, did print) and aſſerts that *Chriſt died a Martyr for Presbitry*, which he proves by theſe Words, *Jeſus of Nazareth King of the Jews*; which if true, will it not follow, that the Jews were Presbiterians? And if ſo, will it not follow from that, that it was the Presbiterians that crucified Chriſt? And if they crucified him, will they ſtand upon it to crucify the Church of *England*? And if this be found to be their Intention, ought not all the true Sons of the Church look to their own Security?

POSTSCRIPT.

WHereas the Presbiterian Queriſts boaſt of their Lenity and Loyalty, they muſt either be in Jeſt, or elſe be ſtranegly infatuate, if they believe themſelves; For the Spirit of the *Hynd let looſe* which juſtifies the Murther of King *Charles* I. and of the Arch-Biſhop of St. *Andrew*'s, is the Complexion of that Party, and a hiſtorical Narration of their Lenity to the Epiſcopal Clergy (even thoſe that did not uſe a Lirurgy and were qualified) in this Revolution will demonſtrate, *That the tender Mercies of the Wicked are cruel.* If ſometimes the Wolf be bound up in Chains, he is but a Wolf ſtill, and as ill as ever he was when let looſe: And their Deſign upon the Church of *England* is manifeſt from their Imprecatory Prayers throughout the Nation, againſt the Biſhops, and the Book of Common Prayer, calling it Popiſh and Idolatrous: Five Hundred Inſtances can be given of this, I ſhall mention Two, One is of *B. F*, who ſaid, *Lord bear down this Popiſh and Idolatrous Book of Common-Prayer, and if Thou do not more for us* Lord, *will Thou keep it on the other Side of* Tweed: And the ſame Perſon in a Sermon ſaid, *They tell us Prayers and Tears are proper Weapons of the Church; but Sirs, I'll tell you much better*, Swords and Piſtols.

Again, about Three Years ago, when an *Engliſh* Regiment lay near to the City of *Edinburgh* and uſed the Engliſh-Service, the *Presbiterian Holder-forth* in that Place, took Occaſion to expreſs himſelf according to the ignorant Zeal of the Partie, and in the common Cant told in Pulpit, That the Book of Common-Prayer was rank Popery and Idolatry; at which the Chief Officer of the Regiment (hearing that this was ſaid) gave Orders to the Chaplain to lay aſide the Service, becauſe it gave Offence; which gave great Occaſion of Clamour among the well principled People, who are the Supernumerary Part in that Paroch, and gave Ground of Jealouſie to infer, that the Commanders were either Heart Phanaticks, Luke-warm, cowardly or were brib'd by the Presbiterian Party.

The next Lords Day, the *Holder-forth* took Courage to ſay to his People, 'You 'ſee Sirs we have ſilenced a Regiment, we'll ſoon ſilence the Curate: The Church 'of *England*, Sirs, is the Great *Goliah*; but the Kirk of *Scotland* is but *Little-Davie*; but 'you'll ſee *Little Davie* will take a Sling and a Stone, and brain the Great *Goliah* to 'the Ground.

Whereas the Anti-counter-queriſt in his 10th Querie aſſerts, That *R.C.* was convict of Forgery, anent *M.* D's Catechiſm by *M. W J.* It is anſwered, That *M. W. J* was convict of *M. R. C*'s Candour and Ingenuity, and produced the Book before famous Witneſſes in *Edinburgh*, who are ready to prove the Anti-counter-queriſt to be an impudent Liar. A publick Account of this Matter ſhall be ſhortly publiſh'd, and that to the Diſgrace of the Party.

It is better known in the *Stewartrie* of *Orkney*, that a reverend Brother of that Party was convict of Sheep-ſtealing; and when this was brought above, the whole Fraternity concerned themſelves for the poor guilty Brother, and interceeded with the Juſtices of Peace to let that Proceſs fall: The Juſtices would not do it, but upon Condition, that all the Brethren ſhould ſay the Lord's Prayer in their reſpective Congregations, which was yielded to, and (as we hear) continues ſo: I conclude therefore, that it was a happy Sheep-ſtealing that brought in the Uſe of the Lords into that Country.

FINIS.

Digitized by Google

Queries to the Presbyterians,

(By the Author of the *Anti-counter-Queries, Counter-queried*)

Upon ſeveral Things mention'd in their Queries, in their Addreſs and Petition to the QUEEN upon the Toleration, and their other Papers; *Viz.* I. *As to Their Lenity.* II. *Their Loyalty.* III. *Of the good Character they give to themſelves.* IV. *Of the vile Titles they give to the Clergy.* V. *Of their own Sufferings in the Time of Epiſcopacy.* VI. *Of the Divine Right of their Government.* VII. *Of the Purity of their Worſhip.*

I. *Of their Lenity.*

PAſſing by the Cruelties they exercis'd upon very many in the Days of *Oliver*, ſuch as Dr. *Wiſhart*, afterwards Biſhop of *Edinburgh*, whom they kept Seventeen Months in *Haddo's-Hole*, without permitting him ſo much as to change a Shirt; how ſhall they anſwer for their Lenity in the Beginning of this Revolution, in the Rabbling out of above Three Hundred Miniſters, in expoſing them and their Families to the Inclemency of the Weather, in the Dead of Winter, to the Hazard and Loſs of ſome of their Lives? And how did the Firſt P--------- in the 1690 Year ratify the Deed of the Rabble, that Miniſters remov'd by that Crew, ſhould have no Acceſs to their Paroches; and this without giving a Hearing to them, or granting to them the Privilege of a common Thief? And when this was toſs'd in P--------, that it would be a Reflection to ratify ſuch a Deed; it was carried on by this Reaſon, That it was the Way and Method of the Reformation: So will not this Inference clearly follow: Whatever was done at the Reformation, ſhould be a Rule to Poſterity; but Rebellion and Rabbling was ſuch, therefore it ſhould be a Rule to Poſterity? And did not M. *G. M.* in a printed Sermon on 137. Pſ: 5. in the High-Church, approve of this Rabbling; ſo that the Actors, by his Goſpel, were not obliged to repent of their Presbyterian Revolution-Lenity? And yet have they not the Confidence, in their Petition, to ſay, That they took in and continued ſeveral Hundreds of Epiſcopal Miniſters in *Scotland*; whereas after a critical Search, it will be found, that there were ſcarce 30 Apoſtates of the Clergy, that went in to Preſbytry in *Scotland?* And for them that were continued, was not that to be imputed to the happy Circumſtances of the Miniſters, to which Presbitry could have no Acceſs, nor peaceable Living? And were not many others in a conſtant Vexation by the Tiranny of Presbitry, perſecuted, without giving an Account of their Informers or Accuſers, tho' in the Caſe of a Presbiterian Teacher, they acted far otherwiſe? What falſe Stories, Lies and Calumnies, ſuborning and encouraging of falſe Witneſſes, did they not raiſe and practiſe, to thruſt Miniſters from their Livings, without asking a Queſtion for Conſcience Sake? Is not this too well known, and ſhall be proven in ſeveral Places in the Nation? We can inſtance a large Town and Incorporation in the North, where M. *W. M.* a Presbiterian Teacher, intending to make Room for Two Teachers of his own Gang, by raiſing falſe and defamatory Libels againſt the Two Epiſcopal Miniſters of the Place, a young Gentleman (who was educate Preſbiterian) told, The Epiſcopal Miniſters were good Men, and generally beloved of their People, and it would be a Difficulty to get them turn'd off. Beſides he told, that theſe were Unchriſtian and Unlawful Methods: To which M. *W. M.* that Presbiterian Goſpeller, anſwered, thus, *We muſt have up Presbitry at any Rate:* Which indeed cool'd the Gentleman's Affection to Presbitry for ever. And now when Presbiterians have the Impudence to ſay at home, That they brought in and continued ſeveral Hundreds of Miniſters, where almoſt every Shire in the Nation can further give them the Lie, what may not they ſay Abroad and among Strangers? Beſides, how mercileſly were ſeveral Miniſters perſecuted by *S I S A*, without making any Difference betwixt Compliers and no Compliers, is and ſhall be proven: For not long ago did he not perſecute them ſeparately with's Presbiterian *Dilemma*, thus: To one he ſays, *Have you complied?* If it was anſwered, *Yea*; he told, *I love you all the worſe, they are honeſter Men that did not.* To another, if he asked, *Have you complied?* If it was anſwered, *Nay*; then he ſays, *How can you then expect any Favour from the Government?* So herein, as in many Things elſe, he ſhew the Spirit of the Party.

II. *Of Their Loyalty.*

IT is ordinary for Presbiterians, on ſuch Occaſions, to caſt up their Loyalty; but I ask them, Whether this be in their Principle or in their Practice? If in their Principle,

Digitized by Google

ciple, muſt they not abjure the *Solemn League* and *Covenant*, which limits the King, but not the Parliament? If in their Practice, how ſhall they prove their Loyalty from the Days of Queen *Mary* of *Scotland*, when they refus'd to her Son K. *James* the VI. to pray for her, when Priſoner in *England* and in Hazard of Execution, which came on her at laſt; the King's Words were a very Chriſtian Petition, *That it might pleaſe God to illuminate Her with the Light of His Truth, and to ſave her from the apparent Danger wherein ſhe was caſt.* The King gave Orders to the Arch-Biſhop of St. *Andrews* to officiate at *Edinburgh* that Day; but by the Order of the Kirk, the Arch-Biſhop was prevented by ſetting up one Mr. *John Couper*, a Probationer; which the King ſeeing, told from his Seat, That Place was appointed for another, but if he did obey Commands, he ſhould be allowed to proceed: *Meſs John* told ſawcily and phanatically, *That he ſhould do as the Spirit ſhould direct him*; and thereupon very juſtly was forced to give Place to the Biſhop. *Spotſw: Hiſt: P:* 354.

Another Inſtance of Loyalty to King *James* the VI. is of Mr. *John Welſh*, who preach'd, That *the King was poſſeſt with a Devil, and one Devil being put out, ſeven worſe were to enter. And that the Subjects might lawfully riſe, and take the Sword out of his Hand.* *Spotſw: Hiſt:* P. 430.

Witneſs alſo Mr. *Robert Bruce*'s ſawcy Reply to the King: *I ſee, Sir, your Reſolution is to take* Huntley *in Favour, which if you do, I will oppoſe, and you ſhall chooſe whether you ſhall loſe* Huntley *or me, for both you cannot keep.* *Spotſw:* P. 417. This Story is brought in to prove one of the Cauſes of the Decay of Chriſtian Piety, by the Author of that Book.

But above all, Mr. *David Blake*'s Pulpit-Language is memorable, *That the King had detected the Treachery of his Heart: That all Kings were the Devil's Bairns: That he might pray for the Queen for Faſhion's ſake, for ſhe would never do them good: That the Queen of* England *was an Atheiſt.* And other inſolent Speeches to this purpoſe, is recorded by *Spotſ.* p. 423. *&c.* and the ſaid *Blake* when cited, was backed with his *Kirk-Brethren*, and declined the King and Council as proper Judges of Miniſters Doctrines in Pulpit, as is recorded in the publick Regiſters at that time; which is a Vindication of the Verity of Archbiſhop *Spotſwood*'s Hiſtory, and of Archbiſhop *Bramhall*'s *Fair Warning to beware of the* Scots *Presbyterian Diſcipline.* Which ſtands true and ſure, for all the pretended Anſwer given to it by Mr. *Robert Baillie.*

This, with their appointing a Faſt on that Day, wherein the King appointed a Feaſt for entertaining the *French* Ambaſſador; and their attempting to keep the King Priſoner in the Council by a Rabble, Headed by the Lord *Lindſay* of *Byres*, are Demonſtrations of their Villainy and treaſonable Practices.

And as for King *Charles* I. it is evident to a Demonſtration that they were the Perſons Unking'd him, and delivered him to the Hands of thoſe that beheaded him: It was their Principle to fight againſt him in the Field where they might kill him with a Muſquet Ball; and what Difference is betwixt that and bringing his Head to a Scaffold? And whether was it they who reſiſted the King, or they who aſſiſted him, that took away his Life? Or who did execute *Montroſe*, the Inſtrument that appeared in his Defence? Or who was better acquainted with Presbiterian Principles than the Author of the *Hind let looſe*, who vindicates the Murder, and whom the Kirk in this Revolution ſent to St. *Andrew*'s as Teacher, and as a fit Man to train up the Youth at the Univerſity, and there to preach his looſe Principles? And is there any thing more true than what the Independents ſay to the Presbiterians, *It was you that took off the King's Head; for we took off but* Charles Stuart's *Head*? Or as *Salmaſius* ſays, *It was the Presbyterians that bound the Sacrifice, and the Independents that offered it.* The *Solemn League and Covenant*, the *Act of the Weſt-Kirk*, and the *Penitential Addreſs of the Synod of* Aberdeen, *&c.* which may be inſerted in theſe Miſcellanies, will declare who are to be blam'd for this barbarous Murder.

And for your Loyalty to King *Charles* II. witneſs your Inſurrections at *Pentland-Hills* and *Bothwel-Bridge*, *&c.*

And for King *James* VII. witneſs *Monmouth*'s and *Argyle*'s Rebellion; and Profeſſion of conſtant Loyalty to him, and yet deſerting the ſame King in his Diſtreſs; an Inſtance of your Hypocriſy as well as of your Diſloyalty? And if they inſtance their Loyalty to King *William*, is not this owing to his Power who kept them in awe, otherwiſe would they not have the Kingdom ſworn totheir Solemn League and Covenant before this time of Day?

III. *Of the high and lofty Titles wherewith they extol their Faction.*

THus the Petition begins, *The Church of Chriſt in* Scotland—— *ſecured to us both by the Laws of God and the Realm.* What? Is not the Epiſcopal Church in *Scotland*

a

Digitized by Google

a Church of Christ? Or has Christ two Churches contradictory to one another, the one consisting of a Parity, the other of an Imparity? And how can that be the Church of Christ, that cannot nor dare offer to prove a Ministerial Succession from the Apostles? Or how can they prove themselves Christians when they baptize into a Party and not in the Principles of the Catholick Church, and mostly with a *Covenant*, which nullifies the Terms of the *Covenant of Grace*, being thereby engaged into the Devilish Sins of Schism and Rebellion? And how comes the *Church of Christ* to put so small a Value on Baptism, as not to baptize dying Infants, except it be in a Church or on a Lecturing Day? Yea suffer them to die in the very Church, except their Sermon be done? Or how are they Christians in their Prayers, that will not say the infallible Prayer of *Jesus Christ*? And have not we as great Reason not to call them *Brethren*, as St. *Augustine* had to say of the *Donatists*, *Now we cannot call them our Brethren, because they will not say, Our Father*? Or how are they Christians in their Singing, when they do not distinguish themselves from *Jews*, who will sing the Psalms of *David*, but not one New-Testament Hymn? And if their Pastors have not lawful Ordination, how can they administer the *Lord's Supper*? Or give the Seals of the *Covenant of Grace*? And with what Confidence can they call their Judicatory the *Court of Christ*, where there is so much Partiality, Injustice, suborning and encouraging of false Witnesses, as has been, and shall be further proven to a Demonstration? And can there be a truer Character given of Judges of such Courts of *Christ* (so called) than this, *That truly Christ has little Credit of his Deputes*?

IV. *Of the vile Characters they give the Clergy, to wit, Ignorant, Negligent, Scandalous and Erroneous.*

THe old Schismaticks, who accounted themselves the Godly Party, and rais'd scandalous and defamatory Libels against the Catholick Bishops, are not yet dead; so long as this Party is alive. But as for Ignorance, pray what great Proofs have they given of their Learning? Have not their great Champions in publick bewrayed their Ignorance? Is this a Proof of Learning in *D. R.* in his Vindication of the Kirk of *Scotland*, to say on these Words of St. *Jerome*, *Quid facit Episcopus excepta ordinatione quod Presbyter non faciat*? makes that (*excepta ordinatione*) to be the ordering of the Meetings? Or what great Learning is there in that Author of *Ratio Sacra*, who p. 7. calls *Cain* an *Arminian*, *Socinian* and a *Papist*? Or what greater Ignorance than to say, That Christ died a Martyr for Presbyterian Government, and prove this from 19. *John* 19. *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews*? And for the People, I do not believe there is a more ignorant Crew in Christendom than they are, which I could demonstrate. Who thought they got more good to their Souls, than those who went to Hill-Conventicles, and yet who more erroneous and ignorant? M. *W. V.* an indulged Preacher declares in his *Review of the History of the Indulgence*, p. 527, 528. where he shews, that the People believed, *That Baptism by Curats was the Mark of the Beast*: That it was as lawful to hear them, as to worship *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel*? And that a Woman dying had no other Evidence that it was well with her, but that she never heard a Curat?

As for Negligence, how many Score of Teachers can we instance in the Nation, who never catechis'd, seldom visited the Sick, and never gave the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, tho' they look on themselves as Ministers of Christ?

And as for Scandals, I shall only ask them this applicable Query, Was it not great Confidence in a common Whore, who had born Seven Bastards in Adultery, and Three in Incest, to call a Woman *Whore*, who had brought forth but one Child in single Fornication?

And for Error, as the Party can be libelled with many, may not the General Ass: be indicted for this one, in passing by the Censuring of Mr. *James Hog*, who in the 329 pag. of his *Casuistical Essay*, &c. avowedly affirms, That the saying of the Lord's Prayer, by concluding Prayers with it, *Is an Engine from Hell, subversive of the Gospel of* Christ? And does he not aver, that he doubts not of the Concurrence of the Generality of the Godly to say with him? Now, if this be not Scandal, Erorr and Blasphemy, what else can be so? And tho' this was represented to the Gen: Ass: by *S. H. C.* of *Calder*, was it not slighted? and so must it not be look't on as the Sentiment of the Party?

V. *Of their Sufferings and Persecutions in the time of Episcopacy.*

HEre I question them, Who was it that ever suffered for being either Christian or Presbiterian, but for Practices which Episcopal Persons should suffer for, if guilty of them, as Preshiterians were? Or, I ask them, Whether it was the Presbiterians or Cameronians that suffered? If it it be said, they are all one, then I ask, Why did the Presbiterians in their Address to K. *Ja:* VII. disown the Cameronians as any of

Digitized by Google

their

their Communion? And when *D. R.* vindicates the Presbiterians from the rabbling of the Miniſters, does he not charge the Cameronians with it, who (he ſays) was not of their Communion? Yet do not the Presbiterians inrol them for Martyrs, even Mr. *Cargil*, who excommunicate the King and the Royal Family; ſo that their wild Actings were Cameronian, but their Sufferings are Presbiterian? Or what Government under Heaven would tolerate ſuch Preachers as theſe, who ſaid, That it was as lawful to ſacrifice Children to *Moloch*, as to pay Ceſs to the King? See the foreſaid M. *W. V.* 610 *P.* of the forecited Book.

VI. *Of their Government.*

SEeing Presbiterians look on their Government to be of Divine Right, I poſe them with this Queſtion, which never was, nor ever can be anſwered; *Whence have Presbyterians their Ordination*: If they ſay, from Chriſt, then I ask whether Mediately or Immediately; if immediately, whether from the Magiſtrate, the People, or Apoſtolical Succeſſion? Not from the Magiſtrate, for that is Eraſtianiſm: Not from the People, for that is Independency: Not from the Biſhops, for that they diſown as Antichriſtianiſm. If Immediately, how can they prove it, or diſtinguiſh themſelves from Quakers, or the new Prophets? If they ſay, St. *Paul* ſpeaks, 1 *Tim:* 4. 14. of *the laying on of the Hands of the Presbitry*, then it is queſtioned, Whether or not are they the Succeſſors of that Presbitry, which St. *Paul* ſpeaks of? For how can they prove they are ſo? Or did that Presbitry conſiſt of Preaching and Ruling-Elders? And how came Presbiterians to have a different Notion of that Text from *Jerom* and *Calvin* their pretended Patrons? Or, was not St. *Paul* preſent at that Ordination, who, 2 *Tim:* 1. 6. calls that *the laying or of his Hands*? Or if the Presbiters at the Reformation had Power to ordain, (which was not given to them at their Ordination) how ſhall the preſent Presbiterians prove their Succeſſion from them? Or if *Chriſt* did inſtitute a Presbiterian Parity, how came He in His own College to have Twelve Apoſtles above Seventy Diſciples? If they ſay this was for a Time; what better is their Argument than the Quakers, who ſay (without Proof) that the Uſe of the Sacraments was but temporary, and not perpetual? How can they prove the Time and Place, or by what Scripture can they prove that a Parity did ſucceed to an Imparity? Or how can they prove when Epiſcopacy ſucceeded to Presbitry in any Part of the World in the primitive Times? Is it not then an Hazard to the Souls of Men to be under the Tutory of an uſurped and unordained Miniſtry, who are not ſent to preach, nor have Power to adminiſter Sacraments? Are not the Words of *Jeremiah*, to this Purpoſe, very terrifying, 23d *ch.* 30, 31, 32.---- *I ſent them not, nor commanded them, therefore they ſhall not profit this People, ſaith the Lord.*

VII. *Of the Purity of their Worſhip.*

WHen the Presbyterians ſpeak of the Purity of their Worſhip, I deſire to know where their Worſhip is, to ſee if after Examination of it, any can ſubſcribe it, as Men may or may not ſubſcribe to the Confeſſion of Faith which is in a Book? And if it be impoſſible to know a *Scots* Presbiterian Worſhip, how is it poſſible to ſubſcribe to it? Whether is it the Worſhip of *Edinburgh* or of *Aberdeen*, that I ſhall own? If of *Edinburgh*, whether of the Old Kirk, or of the New Kirk? If they ſay that all have but one Worſhip, then if One, Two or Three of the Teachers prays Blaſphemy or Nonſenſe, muſt not this be look't on as the Worſhip of the *Scottiſh* Kirk? And was it very ſound Divinity, that M. *G. M.* taught, when in Pulpit, he told, *That it was better to have extemporary Prayers than Set Forms, tho' the one half were Senſe, and the other half Nonſenſe?* There are Nine Hundred Pariſhes in *Scotland*, and conſequently Eighteen Hundred Worſhips every Lord's Day; and no Pariſh knowing how the other worſhips GOD: Is not this like a Houſe full of Fidlers, every one playing a different Tune?

If they tell us, that the *Directory* is a Standard for Worſhip, may it not be anſwered, *Firſt*, That the Directory is no Worſhip. *2dly*, That they themſelves obſerve not the Directory, which enjoins the reading of Scripture, and the ſaying the Lord's Prayer. *3dly*, Whether is it a Directory for the Spirit or for themſelves? It is Blaſphemy to ſay that it is for the Spirit; and does it not limit the Spirit to ſay, that it is for themſelves? Have they any Warrant from Scripture to pray publickly off-hand to God, if they be not immediately inſpir'd? Why do they ſing to God by a Book and not pray to God by a Book? Why do they ſtudy their Sermons leſt they ſpeak Nonſenſe to the People, and not ſtudy their Prayers leſt they ſpeak Nonſenſe to God? Is it not a ſad Matter to have a Worſhip to God in Words that they would not have printed, and with Faces that they would not wiſh painted?

Digitized by Google

OBSERVATIONS

On the Treatment of ſome Epiſcopal Miniſters in the North, by the Kirk Presbytries.

Written ſeveral Years ago by Mr. *T. J.* at *I----ſs*; which he called,

The Groans of the Miniſters of the Goſpel in Scotland, *under His Majeſty's Protection by Act of Parliament.*

I. IT is certain, theſe Miniſters never owned the Authority of the preſent Presbiterian Judicatures over them, as Miniſters of the Goſpel, but declared againſt it on all Occaſions.

II. In the Year 1694, when the Commiſſion of the General-Aſſembly came North, and began to ſummon ſome Miniſters in the Dioceſs of *Aberdeen* before them, the whole Miniſters of the Dioceſs came by themſelves or Delegates, and proteſted againſt their Procedure, declined their Authority, and appealed to his Majeſty for Protection, as their Proteſtation printed and publiſhed doth bear. The Miniſters of *Roſs* did ſo at *Inverneſs* that ſame Year.

In this Caſe they continued till the Year 1695, when by the Act of that Seſſion of Parliament, *July* 16. it was declared, *That all ſuch* (*Miniſters*) *as ſhall duly come in and qualify themſelves, as ſaid is,* (that is by taking the Oaths of Allegiance and Aſſurance) *and ſhall behave worthily in Doctrine, Life and Converſation, as becomes Miniſters of the Goſpel, ſhall have and enjoy His Majeſty's Protection as to their reſpective Kirks and Benefices.*

From this Act two Things are evidently clear, *Firſt*, That their being Epiſcopal in their Judgment, and conſequently the refuſing to own the Authority of the Preſbiterian Judicatures over them, could be no Cauſe of Cenſure or Depoſition; for they needed no particular Act of Parliament for Protection in any other ſenſe, but to ſecure them againſt theſe Judicatures: For had they been Presbiterians, or willing to ſubmit to them, then all the Laws of the Kingdom had been in their favours, though that Act had not been made, they need only Protection as to their Opinion; and they had publickly owned and declared, that by a formal Proteſtation and Appeal both at *Aberdeen* and *Inverneſs* the Year before, whereby they utterly refuſed to own their Authority over them, or to ſubmit to it.

As Things ſtood at that Time, the Protected Miniſters feared no Hurt from any thing but Presbiterian Judicatures, and the Nature of all Protections is a Security from ſomething hurtful. It is then a downright Violation of the King's Protection, to depoſe any of theſe Miniſters for owning that Opinion, and pleading the Benefit of that Protection; as the Presbitery of *Roſs* did depoſe Mr. *Robert Roſs* Miniſter at *Tain*, and Mr. *Donald Forbes* Miniſter at *Kilmuir*, in the Year 1699, without any other Malverſation either proven or alledged, but only for refuſing to own their Authority, and pleading the Benefit of his Majeſty's Protection.

This the Officers of State ſeemed ſenſible of: For upon Complaint made by the depoſed Miniſters, they ordered them back to their Charges notwithſtanding the Preſbitry had depoſed them, and the Sentence never taken off; yet in the Year 1700 the Commiſſion of the Aſſembly depoſed theſe two Miniſters *pro ſecundo*, for the ſame Reaſon allenarly.

It is here to be obſerved, that the Judicatures dealt much more ſeverely with the protected Miniſters than they did before they were taken into his Majeſty's Protection: For in the Year 1694, theſe two Miniſters joined in the Proteſtation at *Inverneſs* againſt the Authority of the Commiſſion of the Aſſembly; yet the Commiſſion took

Digitized by Google

no Advantage thereof, but took Trial of the Libels, and not finding them proven, continued them in their Charges.

A *Second* Thing clear from the very Words of the foresaid Act of Parliament is, That thereby the protected Ministers are secured against all Prosecutions for old, dead Scandals preceeding the Date of the Act; which was rational enough, seeing the Legal Judicatures had five Years time formerly allowed to purge out such Ministers as were scandalous or negligent, *&c.* therefore the King might justly protect all such as had escaped after such a long Trial, if they behaved well in time coming; and accordingly the Tenor of the Act runs, *If they shall behave worthily*; that is, in time coming.

Yet in all the Processes, or most of them that have been commenced since that time, the Judicatures have gone back to Scandals alledged committed many Years before the Date of the Act, and so have palpably contraveened the Act of Parliament, which promised his Majesty's Protection upon their after good Behaviour.

What way his Majesty intended to have the protected Clergy tried and judged as to their worthy Behaviour after the Date of the Act, is not so clearly determined. But considering what is already said, That they are protected as to their Opinion as Episcopal Ministers, it is not probable they were still to be compelled to own these Presbiterian Judicatures, which they had so solemnly disowned and protested against.

Secondly, Some of the chief Ministers of State, particularly the then Lord Secretary *Johnston*, assured Mr. *Seton*, Delegate for the Episcopal Clergy in the North, by his Letter dated at *Edinburgh* the 20th of *September* 1695, That they might rest secure that the Presbiterian Judicatures shall not trouble them. And when the protected Clergy Addressed his Majesty thereafter by the said Lord Secretary, he by his Letter *November* 26. assured them, his Majesty would take care they should be easy in their Churches; and this by Order. Now certainly severals of them have been very uneasy in their Churches since that time, altho' his Majesty hath not heard of it, nor can they be easy so long as they are under the Authority of these Judicatures, as will appear by the Sequel of this Paper. And in order to clear this, we shall take notice of some particular Instances of the Hardship these protected Ministers meet with before these Presbiterian Judicatures; and here indeed I am to write things that will scarcely be credited, but I shall say nothing but what can be clearly proven from their own Records.

I. If they offer to plead Exemption from their Authority, and plead the Benefit of his Majesty's Protection, and appeal to the most Honourable Privy-Council; therefore they summarly depose them, as the Presbitry of *Ross* in the Year 1690, and the Commission of the Assembly thereafter in the Year 1700, deposed Mr. *Robert Ross* Minister at *Tain*, and Mr. *Donald Forbes* Minister at *Kilmuir*; therefore the rest, fearing their Fate, dare not offer to disown their Authority, or appeal to his Majesty, as *Paul* did to *Cæsar*, *Acts* 25. 11.

II. In all Processes wherein one's Life, or Fortune, or Reputation is in hazard, the Defender is allowed Fifteen free Days to prepare his Defences deliberately; but tho' the protected Ministers holy Calling, their Liferent Right, and their Good-name be at stake, yet the legal Judicatures allow them far less time: For Mr. *Robert Ross* abovementioned was summoned before the Commission of the Assembly, upon the 9. Day *July* 1700, to appear the 12th Day thereof to answer to a very complexed grievous Libel. Sometimes they summoned them to a Day, and depose them Eight Days before it. Thus the Presbitry of *Ross*, in *July* 1699, summoned Mr. *Donald Forbes* aforesaid, and upon new Considerations deposed him Eight Days before the Diet to which he was summoned, as the Summons and Sentence yet extant can make appear. A Practice without any Precedent.

Sometimes they pass Sentence and Ordinances against them without ever pretending to call or hear them, as in the Year 1698, the Presbitry of *Murray*, conveened at *Invernes*, discharged Mr. *Hector Mackenzie* Minister there, from Preaching in the High Church, allowing him only to preach *Irish* in a little By-Church, and then sent a Notar to intimate the Sentence to him under Form of Instrument: And in the Year 1701 they Libelled him for preaching *English*.

III. By Law and Equity, there ought no Process to be granted till the Complainer own the Libel publickly; and the legal Church-Judicatures grant no Process against Pres-

Digitized by Google

Presbiterian Miniſters without it; yet they never allow that Favour to any Epiſcopal Miniſter, as is clear from their Proceſſes; and it was refuſed to Mr. *Hector Mackenzie* the firſt of *October* 1701, although he urged their own Practice to Presbiterian Miniſters, and condeſcended upon the Inſtance of Mr. *Tait* late Miniſter at *Cullen*. This is done of purpoſe, that the Purſuer may be allowed to be a Witneſs, and frequently there is no other Witneſs but the Purſuer himſelf: And ſeeing there is no Purſuer, the Presbitry muſt ſuſtain that part, and ſo are manifeſtly Judge and Party, and Enemies to both.

IV. In all other Judicatures, the Relevancy of the Libel is to be diſcuſſed before it be admitted to Probation; but before theſe legal Church Judicatures, they declare the Libel relevant before raiſing the Summons, and make an Act thereon, which is intimate in the Summons, as in the Summons againſt Mr. *Hector Mackenzie*, the firſt of *October* 1701; and after that the Defender is not allowed to debate the Relevancy: And if he give in never ſo ſtrong Defences in Writ, he gets no Anſwer, but the Libel goes inſtantly to Probation. Thus Mr. *Hector Mackenzie* gave in modeſt and ſtrong Defences to the Libel againſt him, and craved that the Presbitry might either repel or ſuſtain them, before the Libel was admitted to Probation: But no Notice was to be taken of them till the Probation was cloſed; which is the more ſtrange, becauſe if the Defences had been found relevant, it might have prevented the ſwearing about 50 or 60 Perſons, who gave a very tremendous Oath in that Affair.

V. Though Magiſtrates, Heretors and Pariſhiners, have a very great Intereſt in any Proceſs againſt their Miniſter, yet they allow them not to be heard by their Delegates. Thus they refuſed to admit the Delegates for the Magiſtrates, Heretors and Pariſhiners of *Inverneſs*, to be heard for Mr. *Mackenzie* their Miniſter, *October* 1, 1701.

VI. When they propoſe Objections againſt Witneſſes, and offer others if they be not relevant; yet after one Objection is found and declared tobe relevant to caſt the Witneſs, and admitted to Probation and inſtantly verified, then they caſt the Witneſs for that Time, leſt the Defender ſhould propoſe more Objections, and prove them, and afterward adjourn 20 Miles Diſtance, and then repel the Objection formerly found relevant and proven, and receive the Witneſs *per ſaltum*, when the Defender is ſecure and hath not his other Objections in Readineſs, nor Witneſſes to prove them: Thus *George Cuthbert* of *Caſtlehill* was juſtly caſt from being a Witneſs againſt Mr. *Hector Mackenzie*, upon an Objection found relevant and proven at *Inverneſs*, 2d *October* 1701, and received again at *Forreſs* the 16th of that Month, as the Minutes of Proceſs, allow not this to Epiſcopal Miniſters, though they require it under Form of Inſtrument, the Proteſtation taken by Mr. *Mackenzie* againſt the ſame, do clearly prove.

VII. By Law, all Witneſſes ought to be purged of partial Counſel; that is, Of having any hand in raiſing or abating the Libel, or ſoliciting the Judge againſt the Defender; yet they allow not this to Epiſcopal Miniſters, though they require it under Form of Inſtrument, as is clear from the Minutes of Proceſs in Mr. *Mackenzie*'s Caſe.

VIII. By Law and Equity, the Defender ought to have a Liſt of the Witneſſes to be adduced, with a Copy of his Libel: And though the Presbiterian Judicatures pretend to do ſo, yet they bring in Witneſſes, againſt whom the Purſuer might juſtly except, of whom he never heard till they be called at the Bar; ſo that he neither can have Objections ready, nor Witneſſes to prove them: Thus they received ſeveral Witneſſes againſt Mr. *Mackenzie*, both at *Inverneſs*, and afterward at *Forreſs*, whom he never heard of till they were called at the Bar, as the Minutes of Proceſs will make appear.

IX. Whereas all Witneſſes ought to be examined in Preſence of the Party; yet the Presbiterian Judicatures ſometimes neither allow the Miniſter nor the Pariſhiners to be preſent at the receiving the Witneſſes, either to object againſt them, or ſee them ſworn or purged of Malice or partial Counſel, or leave their Depoſitions, as they did to Mr. *Robert Roſs* in *Tain*, *July* 1700.

X. If the Witneſſes adduced, don't prove the Libel, then ſometimes they ſend out thro' the Country to ſearch for new Witneſſes, ſometimes in publick Mercats, and bring them into a Tent, and take their Depoſitions there, while perhaps they are drunk, and the Defender never called thereto. Thus in a Proceſs againſt Mr. *Hugh Frazer* Miniſter at *Croy*, they ſent M. *A. A.* and M. *J. C.* Two of their Number to a Mercate at *Red-Caſtle*, who ſearched for Witneſſes, and brought in ſome Country-People to a Tent, and took their Depoſitions, although the Defender was not preſent, or knew

Digitized by Google

knew any thing of it, but was attending the Motion of the Commiſſion of the Aſſ: at *Inverneſs*, and never had any Liſt of theſe Witneſſes given him. This was in *July* 1700.

XI. If the Witneſſes adduced cannot prove the Libel, then they expiſcate other Things from them extrinſick thereto. Thus in the ſaid Proceſs againſt Mr. *Frazer*, *Peter Tulloch* in *Conton* was adduced as a Witneſs, to prove that Mr. *Hugh* had married one *John Mackenzie* who had a Wife living in the Paroch of *Conton*, to a Woman in the Pariſh of *Croy*. *Tulloch* being ſworn, was interrogate by the Moderator, if he knew the ſaid *John Mackenzie*, he anſwered, *No*: Then, leſt the Name had been miſtaken, he asked if he knew one *John Mackean* who had done ſo, he anſwered as formerly: Then the Moderator asked, by the Oath he had made, if he knew the Man they mean't? Then he told a Story of one *Moriſon* who had a Wife in *Conton*, and he heard was married in *Croy*; as the Minutes of Proceſs and Mr. *Hugh*'s Remarks upon the Depoſitions of the Witneſſes will prove.

XII. If the Articles libelled and proven be not ſufficient to infer the Sentence of Depoſition, then they bring in new ones in the Heat of the Proceſs, and ſurprize the Defender, ſo as to give indeliberate Anſwers, and then proceed to Sentence for theſe. Thus the Comiſſ. of the Aſſ. in the ſaid Proceſs againſt Mr. *Frazer*, adjourned from *Inverneſs* to *Croy*, and there ſearched for new Articles, and particularly anent a Child found a Nurſing in his Pariſh, no way relative to the Libel, and made that one of the Grounds of the Sentence.

XIII. If they have no Shadow of Probation, then they ſuſpend, and refuſe to clear the Party by his Oath, as the Presbitry of *Aberdeen* did to Mr. *Clerk* Miniſter at Chapel of *Garrioch*, and under that Sentence he muſt ly till they be able to prove the Thing, though it were perhaps Seven Years; or elſe they ſet their Agents to work to threaten them to demit for preſerving their Miniſterial Character, and perhaps promiſe to be paſſive, and allow them another Place, as they did to Mr. *Mackenzie* Miniſter at *Inverneſs*, in the Year 1701.

XIV. When the protected Miniſters, for Peace ſake, and for ſhuning a calumnious Libel, capitulate with one Judicature, then another Judicature declares that Agreement null, and enters in Proceſs upon the ſame Grounds. Thus an Information being given in againſt Mr. *Hector Mackenzie* Miniſter at *Inverneſs*, to the Commiſſ: of the Aſſ: for the North, in the Year 1700, whereof the Presbitry of *Murray* was a part, the Commiſſion very juſtly thought the Articles not relevant to ſuſtain Proceſs, and therefore ſent out ſome of their Agents to treat with Mr. *Mackenzie*, to draw him to a Capitulation, which he, for ſhuning Contention was content to yield to; and accordingly it was ſtipulate mutually between the Commiſſ: and him, That he ſhould demit his Charge at *Inverneſs*, providing he got an unanimous Call to another Church, where he could live comfortably, and have a legal Security for the Stipend, and ſtay at *Inverneſs* till that were done, and till a Presbiterian Miniſter were ſettled there; yet the Presbitry of *Murray*, without any Regard had to the Capitulation, entered in Proceſs againſt Mr. *Mackenzie*, and threaten every Day to depoſe him, although none of the Conditions of the Capitulation be yet fulfilled. And when one in like Caſe pleads his Innocence, their Agents tell in plain Terms, they have the Law and Goverment on their Side, and let them call and reduce.

XV. They allow the Party alledged to be wronged to be Judge: Thus Mr. *Mackenzie* was Libelled for having Acceſſion to ſome Violence offered to Mr. *William Stuart* Miniſter at *Kiltern*, when he came to ſupply the Vacancy of *Inverneſs* in the Year 1691, and yet the ſame Mr. *Stuart* was brought out of the Presbitry of *Roſs* to that of *Murray*, to ſit as Judge upon the ſaid Mr. *Hector* therefore; and accordingly he did ſit both at *Inverneſs* and *Forreſs*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

A Plain and Rational Vindication of the Liturgy of the Church of England; *collected out of the Diſcourſes of ſome of the Reverend Biſhops and Doctors of that Church, by way of Queſtion and Anſwer, by* J. Clutterbuck *Gent. Is to be ſold by* James Watſon, *at his Shop next Door to the* Red Lion, *oppoſite to the* Luckenbooths. *Price Sixpence.*

Digitized by Google

A RETURN to Mr. John Anderſon *the Presbyterian Holder-forth at* Dumbarton, *his familiar Letter, to the Author of the Anſwer between the Curate and the Countryman, concerning the* Engliſh *Service, or Book of Common-Prayer.*

SIR,

I WAS taken up this laſt *Lent* with an Exerciſe which did not permit me *to anſwer a Fool according to his folly*, in the Senſe that *Solomon* allows me to do it, *Prov.* 26. 5. And I hope I am ſtill better employ'd, than to *anſwer a Fool in his folly leſt I be like to him. Verſ.* 4.

I received thy familiar Letter of Nine Sheets of Paper, conſiſting of notorious Lyings, Slandering, Railing, Banterings, tedious Excurſions, and moſt impertinent Digreſſions. And to let the Kingdom know that thou haſt been an old *pedantick Domine*, teaching *Hac dat a*, thou flouriſhes thy whole worthy Performance with *Latin* Sentences, ſcattered almoſt throughout every Page thereof.

Domine Anderſon, I declare I am ſo well pleaſed with it, that, were there no more Copies in the World, but what I have bought for my ſelf, I ſhould (for as low as my Circumſtances are) be at Expences to reprint it; to let the World ſee what manner of Spirit that Party is of, who are delighted with *pedantick Domine Anderſon*, as a Champion of their Cauſe.

The Gentleman who firſt told me of it, ſaid, Truly, he thought the Author was mad. I ſaid, (perhaps) it was *too much Learning that made him ſo*: But when I once read it, I found it verified, That *Scolding is no Scholarſhip*. I found a Stone weight of Railing for an Ounce weight of Reaſoning: I could not but compare it to a large Pock-pudding, made up of ſix Dozen of rotten Eggs, half a Dozen of Raiſins, and all the reſt *Dirt*, *Dockens* and *Draff*. We have a true, tho' naſty *Scotiſh* Proverb, That *a Spoonful of S——r will ſpoil a Potful of Skink*: No wonder then, that a Potful ſpoil a Spoonful.

Domine, thou writes as if thou hadſt been bred at the College of *Billingſgate*; or as if thou hadſt been Son or Grandſon to *Jannie Geddes*, a Kail-wife at *Edinburgh*, who is famous for her Talent in Scolding to this very Day.

I ſhall in this Sheet take notice of ſome of thy Lying, Railing and Banter, tho' not of the hundredth part; for that were almoſt to tranſcribe thy ſnarling pitiful Pamphlet. As for thy Reaſoning, a Quarter of a Sheet may anſwer all; and is already anſwered in my Book, for all that thou haſt ſaid againſt it. Howbeit, whatever has any ſhew of Reaſon I ſhall anſwer.

Your familiar Letter, Page 1. begins thus:

I am not much for Ceremonies, as indeed few Whigs are.

Domine, you ought to have added, Nor for Reverence to God, Unity and Uniformity, Order and Decency in Worſhip, Obedience to Superiors, nor for Civilities or good Manners to Men, as your Pamphlet demonſtrates.

Page 2. your Words are of my Anſwer: *Your Book conſiſts of Lies, Impertinencies, Profeſſions of Kindneſſes for Popery, Ignorance, Nonſenſe, Blundering, and to crown all, of a Spice of Blaſphemy.*

Domine, it were an eaſy thing to give thee true Names and Characters, and that very juſtly from the Spirit of thy barking Eloquence, and to call thee *John Fop*, *John Fool*, *John Gooſe*, *John Gouk*, *John of Bedlam*, *The Kail-wife of the Whiggiſh Kirk*, *The Merry-Andrew of the Presbyterian Stage*. But in a Word, *John*, Thou'rt a Liar.

If I call'd thee a Beaſt, I ſhould be far in the wrong to thee; my Reaſon is, becauſe thou art capable of being damn'd: This Reaſon I learn'd from a Brother and Name's ſake of thine, in *P—h*, who, taking his Recreation on a Week Day, went by ſome who were playing at Gouf, where one chanc'd to cry out, —— *damn that Gouf-Ball*! Thy Couſin the next Lord's Day took occaſion to reprove this from Pulpit, in theſe Words, *O Sirs, you are a curs'd Pack here in the T. of* P. *I was going by you the laſt Day, when you were playing at Gouf, and one of you cry'd out*, God damn that Gouf-ball. *A bonnie Tale indeed, to bid God damn a brute Beaſt!*

And that thou art in the State of Damnation I could eaſily prove; becauſe thou art a Schiſmatick, and has gone againſt thy own Light, and *holds the Truth in Unrighteouſneſs*, and that thou ſins for a *Morſel of Bread*, and to ſerve thy own Belly. For all thy Acquaintances that I know, declare, that thou was averſe to the Sect in which thou lives; and do think, that thou does not believe thy ſelf in what thou ſays. I told them, It is not ſafe playing with Sin; it may be a Sport in the beginning, but it will turn Natural in the end: Let a Liar tell a Lie ofttimes over, he'll believe it at laſt himſelf.

The firſt Lie (ſo called) which you charge me with, is Page 2. That *I write, that your Dialogue ſuppos'd a Weſt Countryman to be civil to Curates. Whereas, they are generally taught by their Leaders to hate them as Monſters, and not to treat them with the common Civilities of Mankind.*

To this thou ſays, *Have I attempted to prove it? And, for every perſon of Fame, that I'll get to ſubſcribe to my Aſſertion, you'll get a Score to yours*; viz. *That the Weſt Countrymen are taught by their Leaders, to be civil and courteous to all Men, Curates not excepted.*

Domine, thou mighteſt well underſtand, if thou were not reſolved to be contentious, (which is the nature of every one that is proud and paſſionate, and of thoſe that conceal the Truth upon a political and worldly Conſideration) that I meant the Generality of the Commons, who are blindfolded by falſe and uncivil Teachers like *Dom. And.* For if any of them be civil, I am ſure they have not learn'd that of thee: So that the words of the Prophet are verified, *Hoſ.* 4. 9. *Like People, like Prieſt.*

I do not reckon all the Presbyterians, nor all the Weſt Countrymen alike; becauſe I know the contrary. But this I ſay, that many of them owe their good Behaviour to their Complexion; and others to a civil Education; and not to the ſurly, ſoure and dark Principles, and moroſe Converſation of ſome of their Teachers, nor to the uncivil Example of *Dom. Anderſ.*

Our Saviour diſcountenanc'd the ſchiſmatical Church of *Samaria*, when he ſaid to the Woman, *John* 4. 22. *Salvation is of the* Jews; yet He ſuppoſed *Luke* 10. 30. *&c.* that there might be ſome better men there, than either a Prieſt or a *Levite* who was in the true Church. Nevertheleſs our Saviour would not ſend the *Samaritan* Leper to that ſchiſmatical Kirk, to get a Declaration of his being cleanſed; but ſent him to *Jeruſalem*: And yet he was the only civil Perſon of the Ten that returned to give *Chriſt* Thanks.

Our Saviour commended the Woman of *Canaan* for her Faith; and the Centurion, for his; and upbraided thoſe that were in the true Church: Yet this does not ſay, that it is indifferent whether we ſhould be in a true Church or not; or that we are ſure of Salvation any way. Some *Turks* may be far better Men, than many who go under the Name of Chriſtian; and perhaps I may truſt a *Turk*'s Word ſooner than ſome Chriſtian's Oath: Yet this will not ſay, that the *Turks* are in a ſafe Way to Salvation; but that it tends more to the Chriſtian's Condemnation, who is not the Perſon that he ſhould be, according to his Profeſſion.

Thus when I ſay, that the Commons in the Weſt are generally taught to hate the Curates as Monſters; that is as true, as that the *Arabians* are Thieves, and that *all the* Cretians *are Liars*.

Now in proving ſuch Aſſertions, there is no Obligation upon me to go through every Individual. For there are ſome National Sins, and peculiar to one Corner of a Country more than to another. That the Weſt Country Commons are generally taught to hate the Clergy as Monſters, is true and morally certain; witneſs the rabbling out of Three hundred Miniſters in the dead of Winter, In the beginning of this Revolution. And as for *dumb Dogs*, it was a Word was never out of their Mouths,

Digitized by Google

when they ſpoke of Curates. When young Children ask'd their Parents, What is a Curate? The Anſwer was, they're dumb Dogs (honey) *they cannot bark.* By this, the young ones had no other Idea or Notion of a Curate, than that of a real Dog. I have heard a Story to this purpoſe of a ServantMaid, who returning with Water to her Maſter's Houſe, told when ſhe came in, *Here is the Curate riding by.* At which the Children run out to ſee the Curate; and taking inſpection of his Perſon, they came running in to their Parents, and told, *O Father, O Mother, he has Face, Hands and Feet like a Man.*

The right Honourable *Charles* Earl of *Lauderdale*, were he in Life, could tell, how, at his Return from *Bothwel-Bridge*, in his Converſe with ſome of the Commons, they told him before Witneſſes, that their Teachers made them believe that the *Biſhops were all cloven-footed.*

The ſecond thing thou impeaches me for as a Lie, P. 4. is, *That* John Knox, *in his* Book of Common Prayer, *appoints the Lord's Supper to be given at leaſt twelve times in a Year: But that moſt Parochins in* Scotland *will not give it once in twelve Years.* And to this you ſay, *That the Communion has been oftner given theſe laſt twelve Years bypaſt, than the whole twentyeight Years preceeding the Revolution.* And you give me a Challenge to put it to a Trial; O Heaven! O Earth! hear the Impudence of this Raſcal, to aſſert a thing which any Man may ſwear, he never put to a Trial, and conſequently was impoſſible for him to know. But this he muſt ſay to ſerve a Turn; an evil Cauſe muſt have ill Means to ſupport it. Whatever may be of late in a ſmall Corner of the Weſt, What is this to the moſt of the Nation? How many could I libel, who, for that ſpace of time, never catechis'd, viſited the Sick, nor gave Communion.

I muſt here put thy Challenge to a Trial, and ſend an Advertiſement throughout the Kingdom for Information; and I am ſure, *Dom. Anderſ.* will come off with Diſgrace.

I confeſs the People are better wanting it, for God will not proſper the Labours of an uſurp'd and unordain'd Miniſtry. *Jer.* 23. 30, 31, *&c.*

I add to this the ſcandalous manner of giving and receiving it, making it no more than the ſaying of a Grace to a piece of Bread and Cup of Sack; and uttering ſuch Expreſſions as this: *Drink your Service to* Chriſt *Sirs.* This I undertake to prove upon the peril of the Cauſe.

Thirdly, You charge me with another Lie, in theſe Words that I ſay, *The Epiſcopalians have the good things that the Papiſts have*; and *Presbyterians have their worſt things*: *And that Mr.* Robertſon, *once a Diſſenter and now a Conformiſt, did make a Parallel betwixt the Presbyterians and the Jeſuits.*

This thou denies, becauſe (as thou ſays) Presbyterians are *not guilty of Idolatry*, and that Mr. *Robertſon* a Renegado's Judgment is not to be valued.

To this I return, That your Party is guilty of Rebellion by Principle and Practice; and this is as the *Sin of Witchcraft*, and of *Schiſm* alſo, which the Ancients ſay, *The Blood of Martyrdom could not waſh away.*

The Infallibility which you deny to the Pope, the Abſolute Power which you deny to the King, the Lordſhip which you deny to the Biſhops, and the Spirit which you deny to the Quakers, every petty Teacher of you aſſumes to himſelf: And if you be not guilty of Idolatry by Images, you are guilty of it in your Imaginations, preferring your own extemporary Rhapſodies and blaſphemous Traſh to the Form of *ſound Words* retained by the Church in all Ages; ſaying your own extemporary Prayers, aud neglecting Chriſt's Form, neglecting the Apoſtles Creed, and ſetting up the Idol of your own *Solemn League and Covenant*, taking more Pains to make the People fulfil the Terms thereof, than making them to underſtand the Terms of the Covenant of Grace, ſtudying to make them Presbyterians rather than Chriſtians. I add, that your Godly greedy Folk are generally guilty of Covetouſneſs, which is the ſlyeſt and moſt dangerous kind of Idolatry.

Beſides I add, that the learn'deſt of your Presbyterians averr, that the Idolatry of *Rome* does not unchurch her: Her Ordinations and Sacraments are valid, but ſo are not yours.

Thou calls Mr. *Robertſon* a *Renegado*, for his coming out of the damnable State of *Schiſm* and *Enthuſiaſm*, into the Boſom of the Church, where there is a Title to Salvation; whereas it is well known, that Place and Preferment was never a Motive of his Converſion, and 'tis notour that thou left the Church and went into the Schiſm, meerly for thy *daily Bread*, which thou dare not ask from God in Chriſt's Words, fearing to give Offence to the Godly.

A Fourth Lie you ſay I am guilty of is, That the Presbyterians promiſed Moderation to the Papiſts, and particularly to the Chancellor of *Scotland*, not to preach againſt Popery, when Proteſtancy was at the Stake. This you ſay is a Lie, and thou muſt not take it on my bare Word. And to confute me, you inſtance Dr. *Hardie.*

Herein I affirm that thou art an impudent Liar, and tho' I be ſparing to name Perſons, yet herein I bring in a Gentleman of unqueſtionable Reputation, and that is *Blair-Drummond*, who well knew your Goodwill to ſink the eſtabliſh'd Church, and will mantain what I have ſaid to be true, in ſpight of what impudent *Dom. Anderſ.* can ſay or write. And as for Dr. *Hardie*, (which is the only Inſtance thou can give) it is well known, that when he was made Priſoner for his plainneſs, that his brethren at their viſiting of him took occaſion to rebuke him of Raſhneſs and Imprudence, particularly Mr. *H. K.* the Moderator, who in his zealous Repetitions, (whether vain or not let *Dom. Anderſ.* judge) told, *Brother, Brother, unſeaſonable Truths, unſeaſonable Truths.*

A Fifth Lie thou endeavours to brand me with, is, That I ſaid, That Presbyterians do not read the Scriptures in publick, unleſs it be for a ſhort Text to a long Sermon, or for a long Text to a ſhort one.

Is not this generally known throughout the Kingdom, that you do not read Scriptures unleſs an immediate Expoſition follow thereon, which was the Error that Mr. *Robert Baillie* Profeſſor of Divinity at *Glaſgow*, charg'd the Independents with, when Presbytery and they were by the Ears in former Times. See his *Diſſuaſive from the Errors of the Times.* And dare thou ſay, that the Hundredth part of Scriptures are read in your Congregations by Preaching and Lecturing, as are read in Liturgical Congregations throughout the Year? And now, *Domine*, tell me, Why do ye omit the plain Reading of the Scriptures? Have you any better Reaſon for omitting this Ordinance, than a Presbyterian Ruling Elder once gave, *viz.* That they were ſworn by the Covenant not to read Scriptures in publick: For the Bible had many Chapters, and they were ſworn againſt *Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, Deans* and *Chapters.*

When will *Dom. Anderſ.* fall upon ſuch a Knack as that? *That's above his Thumb.*

A Sixth thing in my Anſwer, which thou calls a Lie is, *That I ſay that there is not a trifling Objection in the Dialogue, but has been anſwered an Hundred times by the Ritualiſts, and that more than an Hundred Years ago, particularly by* Thomas Hutton.

Thou anſwers to this very learndly, That *Thomas Hutton* has not anſwered the laſt Objection againſt the Rubrick for finding out *Eaſter*, I tell thee, He anſwer'd all the Objections that came in his way; and that of *Eaſter* is no Objection againſt the Book of Common Prayer, but againſt the Calendar, or the right Enumeration of Time, which does not marr the Duty and Order of obſerving the Solemnity of our Saviour's Reſurrection, even tho' they go wrong as to the Rule.

The laſt Lie thou challenges, is, that I ſay, *That Preſbyterians leave no Stone unturn'd, no Method untry'd, to prevent the ſpreading of the Book of Common Prayer; for if Lies and Calumnies, and concealing the Truth from their Followers, can do them ſervice they don't ask a Queſtion for Conſcience ſake.*

For the Truth of this I appeal to the common Experience of the three Nations. I could write as many Sheets as *Dom. Anderſ.* has done to prove the Truth of this, how by Ignorance, and (which is worſe) by Malice you have traduc'd the Liturgy in Preachments, perhaps it may be done by another Hand.

When I have added, *Not asking a Queſtion for Conſcience ſake*, thou tells, that the Countryman in the Dialogue

Digitized by Google

logue, has ask'd more Queſtions than it is thought all the Curates in *Scotland* can anſwer for Seven Years. It ſeems *Domine*, thy Trumpeter is dead; I appeal to the Reader of your Dialogue and my Anſwer, whether or not I have omitted any thing of weight or moment; (for I am not obliged to anſwer to thy railing Pedantry nor Impertinencies) and if thou thinks I have, pray, put in what is material by it ſelf, without Inſultings or inſolent Banters, and if I cannot anſwer thee and all thy Gang, I ſhall yield: But thou having naturaliz'd thy Temper to Pride and Malice, thou can as eaſily take this Counſel as thou can ſhake off thy Skin in the manner thou can pull off thy Glove or thy Shirt.

I add to this, that a Fool may ask more Queſtions in an Hour, than a wiſe Man can anſwer in a Week.

Thou tells us alſo, Page 9. *That the Author of* Altare Damaſcenum, *and of the* Popiſh *Engliſh* Ceremonies, *and the Author of the* Dialogues *and* Letter, that is thy learned and worthy ſelf, all Three *Scotſmen*: *Now Sir*, (ſays thou) *name me one of the Epiſcopal Perſwaſion in* Scotland, *that has written as much for making People underſtand what is in the Book of Common Prayer, as the leaſt of theſe Three has done.*

O pitiful Wretch! Have not the Doctors of *Aberdeen*, in their *Replies* and *Duplies* written for Liturgies and Ceremonies, that which you were never able to anſwer to purpoſe? Has not *Forbes* in his *Irenicum*, written for Liturgies, Ceremonies and Holy-days? And the Author of *Liturgy and Loyalty*, has ſufficiently expoſed your Arguments againſt it. I add, that the Author of *The Lawfulneſs and Expediency of Set-Forms*, has anſwered all that you have ſaid before ever thou turn'd an Author. But the Author of *The Queries upon Set-Forms*, has ſaid more in one Sheet, than all of you have ſaid in an Hundred. It is no matter how much you write, but how well you write: One Guinea is better than a Thouſand Farthings.

Your 2d Article, thou ſays, contains the Anſwerer his Impertinencies; by which (thou ſays) thou means, that which ſaith nothing to the purpoſe, and that firſt is the Story of a poor Woman in the North, who expreſt her ſelf thus: *God be thanked for this gate of it, this teaches People to pray that cannot pray; I never remember the Prayers I heard in the Time of Biſhops or Presbyterians, and if my Heart be good, theſe Words are good.*

This you call impertinent, and that it reflects on the Epiſcopalians as well as the Presbyterians: Was this impertinent, which the poor Woman expreſt to the Advantage of the Book of Common Prayer? that it was more edifying than any thing that ever ſhe heard, in the preſent Times or in the Time of Epiſcopacy, which was but too defective as to worſhip, yet it had a lawful *Ordination*, *Chriſts Prayer*, and a New Teſtament Hymn, which diſtinguiſh'd it from *Jews*, *Turks*, *Socinians* and *Presbyterians*.

The People are generally kept in profound Ignorance of the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, many miſtaking the Chriſtian Religion, thought it was nothing elſe but to be in a Party, againſt the Curates, as I have obſerved in Number II. of this Volum, out of Mr. *William Vilant*, an indulged Presbyterian Teacher, in his *Review of the Hiſt: of the Indulgence*. I remember a Story of a godly She-Saint, whoſe Husband had no Peace with her in his Lifetime, becauſe of his Love to Epiſcopacy; but ſhe miſſing him after his Death, made a grievous Lamentation before a Gentleman, who was once her Maſter: He upbraided her for Hypocriſy, and for her Surlineſs to her Husband, while he was alive, and told her, That he was a far better Man than ſhe was Woman, for all her Pretences to Godlineſs: *Indeed, Sir*, ſays ſhe, *it is true I had more Religion than he, but he kept the Commands of God better than I.*

Two ſighing Siſters, ſometime ago in *Edinburgh*, upon one of their Faſts, converſing, the one asked the other, *Why was this Day appointed?* The other anſwered, *It was a Thankſgiving for the Sins of the Land. Is it a Feaſt-day*, ſaid the one? *Yes*, ſays the other: *Nay*, ſaid a third in the Company, *It is but a Faſt-day. Are they not all one?* ſaid the other.

I cannot forget a Story of other two zealous Siſters, hearing M. *G. M.* repeating after Sermon moſt of the Petitions of the Lord's Prayer, but alter'd it near the end. In the Way of their Return from the Kirk, the one ſays, What thought you of M. *G. M.* who ſaid ſo much of the Lord's Prayer this Day? O! ſays the other, but I was exceedingly afraid that he ſhould have ſaid it out.

Catechiſing is ſeldom or never practiſed among many of you, and when you did make ſome Faſhion of it, it was as ridiculous as your Presbyterian Eloquence.

I mind a Story of a Ruling Elder, who being to get Baptiſm for his Child by a Teaching Elder, the Teacher ſaid, I need not examine you, for you are a Ruling Elder, but for faſhion's ſake, I'll ask you one Queſtion: What is Baptiſm? *Baptiſm*, ſays the Ruling Elder, *Baptiſm* is the Lord's Supper. Such Queſtions as theſe were asked, *What would* Potiphar's *Wife have* Joſeph *do with her?* The Anſwer is not to be mentioned here. The ſame Catechiſt asked another Woman, Where was *Moſes* put the firſt Night that he was born? She anſwered, I think it was in his Bed, or in his Cradle, Sir. Nay (ſaid he) it was in an Ark of Bulruſhes. Nay, ſays the Woman, read over again, he was three Months old ere he was put there. Another asks, Who made the World? Anſwer, God. Whether is he a wiſe God or a fool God? ſays the Teacher. The Reply was, Indeed Sir, I think it is a daft Queſtion. Another catechiſing, asks, Wife! did ever the Devil beguile you? I hope in God (ſaid ſhe) the fowl Thief ſhall never beguile me. No! ſays he, but indeed he beguil'd me an hundred times. The greater Fool was you (ſaid ſhe) to be beguil'd with him, for if he had beguil'd me twice, he ſhould never have beguild me the third Time. Another asks, What is the Mark of a true Faith? The Anſwer was, Thirteen and a Plack. Another asks, How many Elements were there? The Anſwer was, How ſhould ſhe know the Elements. O the Ignorance (ſays he) of thoſe that were bred under Curates; Another Queſtion was, *Maggie*, what are the Saints doing in Heaven the Day? The Anſwer was, The Thing that you will not let us do on Earth, Sir. What is that *Maggie*? They are ſinging Glory to the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt. Hum humph *Maggie* (ſaid he) ſit down.

Another asks, *Tibbi*, how many Commands are there? Anſwer. Ten. Did you break them all, ſaid he? The Anſwer was, No. Indeed and truly *Tibbi*, you broke them all. I do not, ſaid ſhe, think ſo. What Command have you not broken? Anſwer. *Thou ſhalt not covet thy Neighbours Wife.* But did you never covet your Neighbour's Good-man? Nay, Sir, the Command ſays not that. Sit down, *Tibbi*.

Now had not the poor Woman whom I mentioned, Reaſon to bleſs God that ſhe had better Means of Edification than ever ſhe had in time of Epiſcopacy or Presbytery? For to my certain Knowledge, the People cannot repeat the Creed, and ſuch as have Fragments of it, mangle the Words thereof moſt pitifully. As, *Father of Almighty; Spenches Pilate; The riſing and the raxing of the mortful Body.*

And as for the Lady of Quality's Page, who would not join in Worſhip with the Church of *England*, where he was obliged to kneel, ſtand and uncover the Head, but joined with the Presbyterian Worſhip, becauſe he thought he might be Papiſt, Jew or Turk in it: Was not this to the Advantage of the Book of Common Prayer, and the Church of *England*, that it was a Hedge that guarded the Vineyard from the wild Boar and little Foxes?

And as for the Gentleman of Knowledge and Education, who profeſs'd that he learned more Knowledge in the Scriptures in one half Year's time, than ever he did, tho' he was then Threeſcore Five Years paſt. Was that impertinent? For could it be otherwiſe, when he daily heard the Scriptures read, and the Form of ſound Words extracted from them and conform to them? and heard Sermons on the Faſts and Feſtivals, bringing in Scripture and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and by which the Creed was yearly explained in Practical Diſcourſes? He heard Sermons on the Goſpels and Epiſtles of *Eaſter* and *Whitſunday*, &c. in which Seaſons, perhaps *Domine Anderſon*'s Brethren in one place diſcourſed on abſolute *Predeſtination*, Sins of Kings Families, Biſhops being Limbs of Antichriſt, Breach of

Solemn

Solemn League and Covenant. One of you on such Occasions preaches on this Text, *Is thy Servant a Dog?* Another, *Can you speak* Greek? Another, on *Paul's leaving his Cloak at* Troas; and this, instead of preaching the *Resurrection of Christ*, or *the Descent of the Holy Ghost*, &c.

I remember a Story of a Ruling Elder of my own intimate Acquaintance, in a Conversation said to me, You have been advancing Idolatry in the North, by the Book of Common Prayer. What, said I, do you know or understand the Book of Common Prayer? I do, says he. Tell me then, Wherefore is *Whitsunday* kept? I believe (says he) you keep it for *Good-friday*. After I gave him Names, and upbraided him for Ignorance; I told him, It was kept for the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the first Ministers of the Gospel. O! but what Scripture have you for that, said he? I told, the 2. of the *Acts of the Apostles*. He was a Stranger to that History; but he was pretty well acquainted with the Lives of ill Kings in the Old Testament, and with the Scriptures which he thought made for a Rebellion.

The next Impertinence you libel me for, is in P. 12. for the Panegyricks which I bestow on the Book of Common Prayer; and this is one, from the Words of the Prophet, that it is a Method *by which the Fool cannot err*: *Which if true* (say you of me) *sufficiently excuses you for being a Liturgist*; *for no Man on Earth stands more in need of such a Method than your self.*

To which I answer, That I had rather be such a Fool as is meant there by the Prophet, and to hear what the Spirit of God *says unto the Church*, than to be a Follower of such wild, phantastick and schismatical Teachers as thou, whose Ordinances God will not bless, because He has not sent thee. I had rather be a simple Ignorant, which is the Fool meant by the Prophet, than to be such a Fool as thou art, frequently mentioned in the Scriptures, particularly in the Book of *Solomon*, as in the 14. Ch: *Prov.* 16. v. *The fool rageth and is confident*; for of all the bluftering, brazen brow'd, impudent Fools on Earth, *Domine Anderson* is one of the first Size. Thou thinks thy self as far above the Bishops and Doctors of the Church of *England*, as thou thought thy self above thy Scholars, when thou taught them, *Omne vivo soli*, &c. Thy Character of Dr. *South* is, *A Man in frantick Fits*; of Dr. *Sacheverel*, *Monstrum nulla virtute redemptum*; of Bishop *Sanderson*, *Half mad*. But one may swear, that thou art altogether mad, and I am sure not by much Learning; but it is not worth any Doctor's while to contend with thee: For, *Prov.* 29. 9. *If a wise Man contendeth with a foolish, whether he rage or laugh, there is no rest.* Thou art a Man full of thy self, and thou fittest high in the Throne of thy Self-conceit: But there are truly wiser Men in *Bedlam*; and a simple Ignorant is in a better Case than thou. For, *Prov.* 26. 12. *Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him.* And, *Prov.* 29. 20. *Seest thou a man hasty in his words? there is more hope of a fool than of him.* Prov. 10. 18. *He that slandereth is a fool.* Eccl. 10. 14. *A fool is full of words.* This Character exactly agrees to thee; for thou hast an hundred Words of Railing for one Word of Reason. I do confess that the Liturgy is defective for the want of a particular Prayer for mad Men, and for such as are to be hanged. For the first, none in the Kingdom needs it more than *Domine Anderson*; and for the second, it may be his Fate: For *Solomon* saith twice (*Prov.* 10. 8, 10.) That *a prating fool shall fall.* And thou deserves it, if it be true, that, by thy Preachment, thou has been lately instigating People to rise in Arms, for the Preservation of the Kirk. I have used many Words here, because I am speaking to a Fool; for one Word were enough to a wise Man.

The next thing you accuse me of, is "Profession of "Kindness to Popery, which, you say, is a Mystery of "Iniquity; a through Papist, of all the Creatures of God, "on this Side Hell, is the most abominable. And a little after you say, "That you are as sure that Popery is "of the Devil, as that Christianity is of God —— And "that it shed more Blood than runs this Day in the Veins "of all Men on the Face of God's Earth." And several Things to this Purpose.

I am not to plead for Popery, but I cannot call every thing Popery which thou calls so: But little could your pitiful Scriblers say, write or do against Papists, if Matters were put to the push. You may flatter them, when they can do you a Favour; you may rail at them, and rabble their Persons, and plunder their Houses, when you get Opportunity. It is not your Party that Papists are afraid of; for soon might they make an Inroad upon *Britain*, were it not the Hierarchy and the Liturgy, the great Bulwark which is against them, and which you call Popery, and labour to undermine and pull down as well as they. And as for bloody Principles and Practices, which you cast up to them, I say, It is ill flitten, and comes ill from your Party; for, to your Number, Power, Principle, and Practices, you are not a whit behind with them. For, if they gave Occasion to us to observe the 5th of *November*, you gave us Occasion to keep the 30th of *January*. If you object an Assassin *Ravillac* to them; they can cast up a Mr. *James Mitchel* to you. If you object a Rebellion by Papists in *Ireland* to them; they can very justly retort the Rebellion of the Covenanters in *Britain* upon you.

You call the Book of Common Prayer, Popery, and then consequently the Queen must be a Papist; but a Reverend Brother of thine got a *Salvo* for that in a learn'd Pulpit-Discourse. Thus, *This Book of Common Prayer, Sirs, is rank Popery, but God be thanked we have a Protestant Queen.* And the same Person, preaching another time against the *Antichrist*, told, "It is a great Question, Sirs, "whether the *Antichrist* was before *Christ* or after *Christ*; "but it is concluded, notwithstanding of the Preposition "*ante*, that he was after *Christ*. It is a popular Trick with your Party, to make any thing you dislike (tho' never so reasonable) odious, under the name of *Popery*; and to advance Treason and Schism, under the name of the *Cause of God*. But wo be to them *that call Evil, Good; and Good, Evil.*

That Popish Baptisms and Ordinations are valid, is acknowledged by all Protestants; but that Presbyterian Ordination is valid, is not acknowledged by Papists, nor by all Protestants. It is very remarkable, that the Popish Church of *France* would not tolerate a Protestant Episcopacy among them, but a Protestant Presbyterian Kirk. The Reason is, because the Episcopal Clergy could defend their Ordination by Apostolical Succession, which the *French* Huguenotes could not do. And we find, *Monsieur Claud*, in his *Defence of the Reformation*, maintain his Ordination, by Independent-Principles, which Presbyterians in former times confuted very well in their *Jus Regim: Ecclesiast:* shewing that the Body of Believers was not the Foundation of Ministerial Mission.

Ought we not to hold with the Papists wherein they are right? Would not a Presbyterian hold with a Popish Priest, against *Socinians* and *Quakers*, altho' they go under the Name of Protestants? And why may not an Episcopalian side with a Popish Priest, maintaining the Necessity of an Apostolical Succession? See to this Purpose Mr. *Will: Vilant* his *Review* above cited, Page 535, *&c.* where he cites *Samuel Rutherfoord's Peaceable Plea for* Paul's *Presbytery*, Chap. 10. P. 124. *We have not separate from* Rome's *Baptism and Ordination of Pastors*, &c. This he thinks very reasonable, tho' it be not true what he asserts; for he cannot maintain Presbyterian Ordination from *Rome*.

In the 22d Page of your Book, you rail at me for saying, "That there is no Tincture of the *Tridentin* Creed "in the Book of Common Prayer. To which thou learnedly answers, "If so be, it must be a very ill Book; for the 1st Article of the *Tridentin* Creed is, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things visible and invisible.* And the 2d is, *And in one Lord Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God*, &c. Now, all you Whigs, come and behold what a rare Champion you have of *Domine Anderson*, who takes the *Nicen* Creed for the *Trent* Creed: The 1st, made in the Council of *Nice*, held in the Year 325; the *Trent* Creed in Pope *Pius* the IV.'s Time, in the Year 1563. So that there is 1238 Years betwixt the making of both these Creeds. Now let all Men judge, what a raging confident Rascal this is. Had I fallen into such a Blunder, a Sheet of Paper had been spent against me in railing Accusations.

Digitized by Google

stions; he had been as glad as the malicious Party ordinarily is, to hear of a Curate's falling into a grosſ and grievous Sin, or that the Devil ſhould get Victory over him; for then their Pulpits would ring, and Courants and Reviews would ſpread, like Peſt or Muireburn, with it. I was ſure, I had read that Creed of *Trent* 26 Years ago; and for the *Nicen*, we read it in the Service on all Holy-days. And yet the Fool has the Confidence to ſay, That I never read the *Trent* Creed: Had I room, I ſhould inſert it in this Paper.

Again, you ſay, yea even in the Articles of the *Tridentin* Creed, which are ſuperadded to the Apoſtolic Doctrine, a Part of the 15th is, "I do alſo receive and "admit the received and approved Rites of the ſaid Ca"tholic Church, in her ſolemn Adminiſtration of the "Sacraments. And then thou adds, Whereof you "know the Croſs in Baptiſm, Kneeling at the Commu"nion, and the Ring in Marriage, are Three.

Thou calls this the 15. Art: of the *Trent* Creed; whereas it has but Twelve, and theſe Words are in the 4th Article. But, *Domine*, does the Church of *England* retain the Croſs, or Kneeling at the Sacrament with a *Tridentin* Intention? Did not *Luther* retain them before the *Trent* Creed was compos'd? How the Ring in Marriage is retain'd in the Adminiſtration of Sacraments, I do not ſee; for the Church of *England* denies Marriage to be a Sacrament.

Now if ever any Perſon has pray'd, Shame befal thee, I am ſure it has lighted on thee now.

I know the *Domine*'s Miſtake lies in this, That ſome Authors mix theſe Two Creeds together, making an Introduction of the *Nicen* Creed, to uſher in the Additions of the *Trent* Creed. But there is a great Difference betwixt them. For the *Nicen* and *Athanaſian* are Explanations of the Apoſtolic Creed; but the Twelve *Trent* Articles (which make the Partition Wall betwixt us and *Romaniſts*) are Additions to the other Three.

In your 29. Page, thou falls heavy upon me, becauſe I "ſaid, That *Hippolytus*, Biſhop & Martyr, who lived in "220th Year of GOD, and in the Age of Miracles, af"firm'd, that the laying aſide the reading of the Scri"ptures, and of Set-forms of Prayer, was a ſure and "certain Sign of the coming of Antichriſt.

To this thou replies, "Were there no more in all thy "Pamphlet, to ſhew what a pitiful Scribler thou art, "how utterly void of Judgment, this were more than "enough to demonſtrate it. Is thy Judgment ſo quite "debauch'd, as to believe that Book of *Hippolytus* to be "genuine? Art thou quite ſo ignorant, as not to "know, that the Church of *England* Writers, in one "Voice, (I believe) reject it as ſpurious, and repre"ſent the Author, 1. as a phantaſtick Fellow, and full "of Fables. 2. As an Ignorant Fellow — And teaches, "That the Devil himſelf is Antichriſt: For which pur"poſe the Papiſts cite him for ſaving the Pope from that "Imputation. 3. As a fooliſh Author, whom no Man "regards nor reads.

Now good Reader, thou may think by this, that I have got a mortal Wound, and that I am irrecoverably gone; but what if I turn the Chaſe upon this confident Fool? What if the Characters he beſtows on me, recoil on himſelf? Will not this prove him a windy, ſawcy and a crackbrain'd Ignorant? For that all the Church of *England* Writers do condemn him with one Voice, is as manifeſt a Lye as ever was broach'd. I ſhall cite Two of the moſt eminent Divines, who cite that very Paſſage with Approbation. The Firſt is Dr. *Hammond*, in his Preface to his *Annot: on the Pſalms*, P. 5. And this he cites out of *Biblioth: Patrum*. Next, ſee Dr. *Comber*'s Preface to his moſt excellent Book on the Liturgy, citing the ſame Words on St. *Jerome*, who lived in the 4th Century, and an Author whom the Presbyterians pretend to be a Patron of their Cauſe. That he was a Man in great Account among the ancient Heroes of the Church, ſee Biſhop *Taylor* his Sermon preach'd to the Univerſity of *Dublin*, near the End, where he cites St. *Chryſoſt: de conſummat: ſeculi, inter opera* Ephrem Syri, in theſe Words, "O bleſt and "happy Men, whoſe Names are in the Book of Life, "from whom the Devils fled, and Hereticks did fear "them, who (by Holineſs) have ſtopp'd the Mouths of "them that ſpake perverſe things." And a little after the ſame St. *Chryſoſt:* cries out, "Where is the bleſſed "Quire of Biſhops and Doctors, who ſhin'd like Lights in the World, and contained the Word of Life? —— "Where is that *Evodius* the ſweet Savour of the Church? "— Where is *Ignatius*, in whom God dwelt? Where is "St. *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, that Bird of Paradiſe? — "Where is *Hippolytus* that good Man, ὁ ἀνὴρ χρηστὸς, that "gentle ſweet Perſon? *&c.*" Read *Du Pin's Hiſtory of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, and ſee what an eminent Man *Hippolytus* was in the Judgment of the Ancients: This *Du Pin* tells, *That he made himſelf conſiderable by his Commentaries on the Holy Scriptures.* And the Notes upon theſe Words are, "St. *Jerome* ſays, That *Origen*, being excited "by his Friend *Ambroſius*, undertook to write Commen"taries upon the Sacred Scriptures, in Imitation of *Hip*"*polytus.*" Now let the Learn'd World judge, if that was an ignorant, fooliſh, fantaſtick Fellow, whom the eminent and admirable *Origen* would make his Pattern. 'Tis true, he is of Opinion, that ſeveral things are attributed to him, which are not his: But he cites the great and learn'd *Photius* his Commendation of *Hippolytus* Diſciple to *Ireneus*: "His Diſcourſe is clear and ſerious, "(ſaith *Photius*) and he ſays nothing but what is to the "Purpoſe, tho' he has not all the Beauties of the *Aſiatick* Stile.

Now, for the *Devil*'s being *Antichriſt*, is but an Opinion, and (perhaps) as defendible as any other upon that Head. But of this more hereafter.

I ſhall conclude this Paper with thy Sarcaſms on my ſelf, in the Concluſion of thy Book; the Words are, *And dear* Robin, *ſay frankly, what in all the World tempted thee, what unlucky malignant Star of thine overruled thee in writing upon this Subject?* I anſwer, That it was not the Star of *Venus*, that made thee Phanatick; nor the fallen Star of *Lucifer*, that made thee Schiſmatick: For 'tis known, that thou was once Epiſcopal in thy Judgment, until thou married, I had almoſt ſaid miſcarried, and was tied by one of our ſcandalous *Buckle* the *Beggers*. And ſome tell us, That thou art ſtill ſuſpected by the Whigs, and that thou takeſt this railing Method of Scribling, to keep thy ſelf in with them, not out of Conſcience but Knavery.

Thou tells, P. 9. That thou art not bigot, which ſome conſtruct to be, That thou art not fixt to thy Party; which (if true) thou art a Temporiſing Juggler, and an Hypocritical Knave, and that, in my Opinion, is a rank Atheiſt, and no Party can have Credit of thee. Thy next Words are of me, "Tho' thou canſt make a Shift to "ramble through the Offices, as Occaſion ſerves; for "who would be at the Pains to notice, or ſo rude as to "challenge thy Blunderings? Yet was't thou ſo great a "Stranger to thy ſelf, as not to know, that thou could "never ſay one wiſe Word in diſputing for them?

John, the Deſign of the Liturgy is to uſe the Offices for Piety and Devotion, as the Deſign of reading the Bible is for Inſtruction in Matters relating to Faith and Manners. But thou reads the Liturgy, as Deiſts and Atheiſts read the Scriptures, not to be the better of the Word of God, but to make it the worſe of them, to carp at, and ridicule them. So thou comes to the Book of Common Prayer as the Phariſees came to Chriſt, to tempt him, and to make him ſpeak Words that ſhould make againſt himſelf; or as the Soldiers came to worſhip him in a Mockery. And Atheiſts have an hundred times more puzzling Difficulties againſt the Bible, than thou and all thy Party have againſt the Book of Common-Prayer: And yet no good Chriſtian will be ſhaken out of his Faith, for all that Atheiſts can ſay againſt the Bible; nor will any known or ſolid Pietiſt be mock'd from this *reaſonable Service* in ſpight of what ridiculous ſnarling Hell-whelps, like diſtracted *Domine Anderſon*, can ſay againſt the Liturgy.

In the Concluſion of thy worthy Pamphlet, thou tells me that I have a worthy Saying of the Presbyterians, *That they worſhip God in Words they would not wiſh printed, and with Faces they would not wiſh painted.* And that is as true as that *Domine Anderſon* is a *malicious Scribler*, and a *pedantick Fool*. I have many more Sayings than that, in a

Cate-

Catechiſm, wherein honourable Mention ſhall be made of thy Dominiſhip: Such as,

What might be a good Motto in *Domine Anderſon*'s Eſcutcheon?

Anſ. The Fool rageth, and is confident.

What is *Domine Anderſon*'s great Politick?

Anſ. Not to care tho' the Learn'd find him ignorant, if the Ignorant think him learn'd.

Why does *Domine Anderſon* get his daily Bread from the Whigs?

Anſ. Becauſe he gave over to ſeek it from God in Chriſt's Words.

What made *Domine Anderſon* to be once Epiſcopal?

Anſ. The Law of his Mind.

What made him afterwards Presbyterian?

Anſ. The Law of his Members.

I know thou wilt anſwer to this, *Poſteriora prioribus derogant*: But I think, *Priora derogant poſterioribus.*

The next Words are, *I ſhall not ſay, but thy Face might make a tolerable Chimney-piece: For who can look at thee and not laugh? Domine*, I think thy Face might make a good Gibbet-piece; and if thou wert on the Gallows, I am ſure thy Face could not be worſe favoured there than it muſt be in the Pulpit, when thou worſhips God in the *Deformity of Holineſs*. For then thou muſt look like a Man in Epileptick Fits, or like another frighted out of his Wits, or like an Ape taking Phyſick, or like one ſmelling Dung, or another plucking a rotten Sheep's Skin.

When thou ſays, *Who can look on me and not laugh?* I anſwer, An Hundred of thy Cattel will look on me, and gnaſh their Teeth, as the *Jews* did at St. *Stephen*.

Again thou tells me, That thou art ſure, *that I have reaſon a Thouſand times to wiſh, that my Words had never been printed.* To which I anſwer, That if thou be not more ſure of Heaven, thou art in danger of Hell-fire. I know thy Party wiſh my Words had not been printed, but I ſee no Reaſon for my ſelf to repent; and more learned Judges than thou will ſay with me. But for thy Encouragement, *John*, I tell thee, that the Ignorants will call thee one of the learn'deſt Men that put Pen to Paper in this Revolution: For very mean things will go off with them, as lately in *St—g S—re* one of your Reverend Brethren crying down Biſhops, gave this ſtrong Argument againſt it, *I allow of* Johny Biſhop, Sandy Biſhop, Willy Biſhop, Nanny Biſhop; *but for Lord Biſhops, the Back of my Hand to them.*

The People, when diſcourſing of the Teacher, ſaid, O did you ever hear the Biſhops paid off ſo well as was done this Day? The Man is a very great Scholar ſays another. All the Curates on Earth cannot anſwer what he ſaid, ſays a Third. But this Brother differed from another of his Brethren, who preach'd at *I——ſ*; the Precentor having gone to him before Sermon, to receive his Inſtructions, the Preacher asked his Name: He told him, *Alexander Biſhop*. Nay, ſays the Preacher, you muſt not precent before me; and would have ſtopt him, if the Magiſtrates had not declared that he ſhould want a Precentor that Day, if he took not their own eſtabliſhed Reader.

The ignorant Commons will be pleaſed with mean Stuff that comes from Presbyterian Mouths; like a Woman who told my ſelf, that ſhe remembred a Note preached Eighteen Years ago, which made all the Kirk weep ſalt Tears, and that was, *O Sirs! when ye riſe in the Morning, you will not ſay your Prayers to God; and yet the Cow, when ſhe riſes in the Morning, falls on her Knees, and ſays her Prayers.*

Thy next Words againſt me are, *Take Counſel then dear* Robin, *and let the ſecond Dialogue and Letter ly dormant a while; or if thou wilt print any thing on 'em, pray put it in Rhime, for thou art ſaid to have a powerful Hand at Dogrel; and ſo, tho' thou do not convince, yet thou may poſſibly divert thy Reader.*

'Tis true, *John*, a Fool may give a wiſe Man a Counſel at a time; but I know not whether thou be a wiſe Fool or a fool wiſe Man. So *Buchanan* in his Epigrams, ſpeaks of one of thy Stamp.

Sors tibi nominibus nocuit male grata duobus,
Quod dederit ſophia ſtultitiæque parum, &c.

Your ſecond Dialogue I never read, nor did I ever ſee thy Letter; but after this Work is done, I ſhall (God willing) peruſe both. Thy Deſire is to be famous, and I ſhall make thee ſo, through the Three Kingdoms. Some ſtill ſay, that for all this Banter thou art Epiſcopally inclined, and that thou haſt written at this Rate to expoſe the Presbyterians: *But be not deceived, God is not mocked.* And ſeeing thou ſpeaks of Rhime and Dogrel, I ſhall conclude with a Rhime by way of Prophecy, againſt the Oppoſers of the Book of Common-Prayer, and by way of Dogrel upon thy worthy ſelf.

The Firſt is,

Filthy Leachers, falſe Teachers, curſing Preachers, never calm!
By Hook or Crook, you will not brook the Service Book in this Realm.
Spight of you Whiggs, your canting Jigs and *Bothwel*-Brigs, and all you'r Worth,
The Common-Prayer ſhall mount up Stair, both here and there, in South and North.
Railing Ranters, Covenanters, for all your Banters, I foretel;
The Book ſhall ſpread, and ſhall be read, ſpight of your Dedd the Dev'l of Hell.

A DOGREL on Domine Anderſon.

John, thy Head was once Prelatick,
Until thy Tail made thee Phanatick;
And then the Godly took thee in,
Altho' thou was a Man of Sin.
Then thou became, with *Dainty Davie*,
A Baſtard in the Tribe of *Levi*.
A Son of Calumny and Slander,
And a phanatick *Salamander*,
Living in hot Coals of Contention:
For which the Whigs give thee a Penſion.
A Son of Schiſm and of Treaſon,
And a Railer without Reaſon.
A *Mimus*, *Momus* and *Suffenus*,
And made a Whig by Lady *Venus*.
Joining the Club of *Core* and *Dathan*,
Thou'rt made an Officer to Sathan,
An Hypocrite and Soul-deluder,
And Ordinationleſs Intruder.
So Satan that goes to and fro,
Calls thee, *John Anderſon my Jo.*
This Sheet and half draws near a cloſe,
I'll end a Word with thee in Proſe.

Now, *John*, I may perhaps meet with thee in *Latin*, that Language of the Beaſt, which is thy chief Talent, tho' I do not boaſt much of it.

But *John*, canſt thou vindicate the Presbyterian Worſhip in *Scotland*, with as good Reaſon as thou can rail againſt the *Engliſh* Book of Common-Prayer? And that thou can do as well as thou can tell me, who was the *Gaddich a da*'s Father, or *Mack-Ruſblick*'s Mother. And when that is told to thee, it is as little worth the knowing as thy railing pedantick Scriblings are worth the reading: But with this Difference, that when it is known, it does no ill to Soul, Body, Goods, nor good Name, as thy Scriblings do. I ask a Parochiner of *Carnock*, How do you worſhip God in that Paroch? He'll anſwer me, As Mr. *James Hog* pleaſes. I ask a *Dumbartoun* Man, How he worſhips God there? He'll anſwer, As *Domine Anderſon* pleaſes. And is not this ſad, that one Paroch knows not how another worſhips God? Is not this like an Houſe full of Fiddlers, every one playing a different Tune? the one playing *Killicranky*, the other, *Away Whigs away*; and another playing, *John Anderſon my Jo.*

Now, *John*, 'tis very unworthy of a Man of thy great Eminency, to fall upon me a poor old Man, who's paſt twice two and Fifty Years of Age. Yet, as a Pedant, I ſhall beſtow an Anagram upon *John Anderſon*, but I muſt prefix the Word *Dumbarton* to it, to diſtinguiſh thee from others of that Name who are honeſt Men. And ſo it will run thus:

DUMBARTON JOHN ANDERSON.
Anagram.
OUR DAMN'D JOHN BANTERS ON.

Edinburgh, 10. *June*, 1712.

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of an Answer

TO

Mr. *John Anderson*, the Presbyterian Holder-forth at *Dumbartoun*.

IT was an old Observe, *That all great Wits had some Doze of Madness, and few Madmen but have some little Turns of Wit*; which is admir'd the more that it comes from such Persons: But their Wit is not the Hundred Part proportionable to their Madness, We have a plain Instance hereof in Mr. *Anderson*'s Nine Sheets, who look like furious foaming Lunaticks, and resemble the *Corybantes*, the mad Heathenish Priests of *Cybel*, rather than any Man in sober Wits.

In Company I chanc'd one Day to read some Passages of his Pedantry and Railing, one Gentleman laugh'd all the while, another sat gravely, not uttering one Word until we laid aside Reading: At last he breaks into this serious Exclamation, *The Lord pity the poor People who are deluded with such distracted Guides as this Author, taking Railing for Reasoning, and Scolding for Scholarship.* This different Gesture of my Company minded me of a Story of an Atheistical Brother of *Anderson*'s; Mr. *Hugh Peters* by Name, Chaplain to that Monster of Hypocrisy *Oliver Cromwel*. This Chaplain upon a *Saturday* laid a Wager, That he should make the one Half of the Congregation laugh, and the other Half to weep. The next Day he won it thus; by canting, wheening, crying and thundering Terrors, and Damnation to the People on the one Side of the Pulpit; and on the other Side he kept the Pulpit Door open, and his Backside naked to the People. These were Times in which the People were preached out of their Wits, as well as out of their Duty to God and Man; and truly this Kingdom is and will be little better, if such furious Pedants as my Antagonist shall have Liberty to alarm the People with Fears and Jealousies of Popery, and stirring up the poor ignorant Multitude to Hatred of the Book of Common Prayer, which is the best Mean to Edification that ever was in any Church of the World. I shall here take a Review of his Answers which he makes to my Book, which as yet stands unanswered, for all that he has or can say or write against it. Some of my Friends blame me for treating Mr. *Anderson* somewhat tartly in my first Paper, but I never found one but confest that he deserved Ten times more at my Hand, without any Provocation given him.

I hear that Venom is as natural to him as it is to a Toad, and I wonder if he cou'd live in *Ireland* where venemous Creatures die; but I remember that I told him, I should be very far in the Wrong to him if I call'd him a Beast, and I gave my Reason for it in my first Paper. I told my Friends, That I cannot treat a mad Dog that bites me, as I would do a Spaniel that fawns upon me; nor a Vulture as I would do a Lark; nor a Wolf's Whelp as I would do a Lamb. Besides another Reason is, because many of the Party have read his Railing against me, with as great Pleasure as hungry Persons take their Food, and look upon it as unanswerable Reasoning; and call my Reasoning nothing but Railing.

The Charges against the Book of Common Prayer are, 1. Popery. 2. Reading the Apocrypha.

First then, As to the Charge of Popery; I told in my Pamphlet, That Persons who charge the Common Prayer with Popery, should tell us what Popery is; and I said, properly it is owning the Pope's Supremacy. He that looks upon the Pope as the Center of Unity in the Catholick Church, and owns his Authority and Jurisdiction over all Persons and in all Causes, throughout all Kingdoms and National Churches, and that to be of Divine Right, is truly and properly a Papist: And tho' he have other Errors, yet that is not enough to denominate him a Papist; if other Churches that are not Popish, nor do own the Pope's Jurisdiction, maintain the same Opinion or the same Error which is in the *Trent* Creed. Now, if he had been as well seen in the Logicks, or the Art of Reasoning, as well as he is in *Tytire tu patulæ, &c.* he would find a Rule, *Illud est proprium quod convenit omni, soli & semper*: That is only proper which can be said to agree to one Thing, so that it cannot be said of another.

The

The *Greek* and *Armenian* Churches own Prayers for the Dead, and many other Things which the Papists use, (and yet the *Armenian* Church Excommunicates the Pope every Year.) And although (as M. *A.* says) that they shak'd off the Pope's Jurisdiction, yet they retain'd *Transubstantiation* in King *Henry* VIII's Time: Yet that was not enough to denominate them Papists; they might be called Erroneous, but not Papists; yea Papists may disown *Transubstantiation* and yet be Popish, as *Bertram* and *Berengarius* were.

None will deny, but *Scotus* and *Durandus*, two famous Schoolmen, were Popish, and yet disown'd *Transubstantiation*, *Scot. in* 4. *Sent. Cap.* 2. *Q.* 3. *Durand. in* 4. *Sent. Dist.* 10. *Q.* 1. *Num.* 13. See Comber's *Advice to the Roman Catholicks.*

I shall here make a Parallel. To make a *Presbyterian* it is enough that he deny the Jurisdiction and Ordination by Diocesan *Bishops*, and assert, That by Divine Right simple *Presbyters* can ordain without Bishops; and that every Paroch Minister is a *Bishop*: A Man may be a Presbyterian and yet say the *Lord's Prayer*; yea more, and which is very rare, one may be a *Presbyterian* and yet be loyal to his Hereditary King; yea and may preach a *Christmas Sermon* on the 25. *December*. You argue against us as the simple Ignorants amongst you argue against your selves. That it favours of *Prelacy* to say the *Lord's Prayer*, and this they take as a Mark of Distinction betwixt *Episcopal* and *Presbyterian*. I add further, That to own the Book of *Common-Prayer* as a lawful Worship, and preferring it to Extemporary Prayer, is not enough to denominate a Man Episcopal: For a *Presbyterian* or *Independent* may own that Notion, and yet be Presbyterian or Independent still.

Thus Mr. *Baxter* tells us, in his *Cure of Church Divisions*, Page 135. " Many a " time have I rather gone to the Common Prayers, for fear of being a Scandal, to " these same Men who called the going to them a Scandal, that is, for fear of harden- " ing them in a sinful Separation or Error; because I knew that was not a Scandal " which they called a Scandal, that is, displeasing or crossing their Opinion.

I knew a *Curate* who was against the Book of *Common-Prayer*, and a present Kirkman, who told it was the best Bond of Unity, and the greatest Bar of Schism that cou'd be in a Christian Church, and yet the one *Episcopal* and the other *Presbyterian*.

But further, the *Presbyterians*, tho' they are not for Popery, yet they agree with the Jesuits in dethroning of Kings, or making a Conditional King, or such as they can make or unmake at their pleasure; yet this is not enough to say that *Presbyterians* are *Papists*, more than that they are *Prelatists*, tho' they should go to the Book of Common-Prayer.

Presbyterians plead Supremacy over all Kings, over all Persons and over all Causes, as I have proven *Numb.* II. yet this is not enough to denominate them Papists: All the Difference is, that Papists plead a Monarchick and the Presbyterian a Republican Supremacy, as one would change a Guinea or a Crown into a Rabble of Turners.

My Adversary, *Page* 21. repeats what he had formerly said, *to wit*, That the Liturgy is not so good now as the Martyrs left it, and instances that Petition, *From the Tyranny of the Bishop of* Rome *good Lord deliver us.* By the *Roman* Yoke was meant the Supremacy; and *Page* 21. Mr. *Anderson* tells, That in King *Henry*'s Time, People were hang'd for owning the Pope's Supremacy, and at the same time were hang'd for denying *Transubstantiation*. I have told already what is truly and properly Popery; but I add, That I doubt not but when the Pope made Offers to continue the Service in *English*, but that even he wou'd part with the Word *Transubstantiation* too for his Supremacy, and take the *Eucharist* with the *English* Geniculation, and *Calvin*'s Notion of the Sacrament, 1 *Cor.* 11. 24. *This is my Body*.: " Neither does *Christ* offer the Benefit " of His Death and Resurrection to us, but that very Body in which He suffered " and rose again.

But then (tho' I know the Answer will not please) that Petition, *From the Tyranny of the* Roman *Yoke*, &c. it was laid aside in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Days, not to please the Pope, but to bring in *Popish* Subjects to Prayers in the Church; and it was laid aside upon a prudent Consideration, and to gain the scrupulous Subjects to the Unity of the Church: For by an Act they were all obliged to come, under the Pain of a pecunial Mulct or Fine: So this Petition was laid aside to gain them. Thus, Mr. *Durel* in his *Vindic. Eccl. Anglic.* speaks of a malicious Person that objects this to the Church of *England*, not out of Ignorance, for he knew there was such an Act, but for Wrangling

and

Digitized by Google

and Contention's sake. I hear M. *A.* left the saying of the *Lord's Prayer*, contrary to his own Inclination, because some few pitiful Bodies run out when he said it: And his Brethren in some Places in the North, are forc'd to say it, to keep the People together: Altho' Mr. *Hog* says, that the saying of it after Prayers, *is an Ingine from Hell*, and tho' the bigot ignorant Commons call it an *Idol* and a *Rot-Rhime*.

I remember, some Years ago, that I liv'd in a Place where I was in Friendship with the Presbyterian Teacher of the Parish, and inviting me to be his constant Hearer, offer'd this Condition, *That I should never hear him pray against Prelacy.*

But, to conclude, let it be observed, That the Church of *England* does not own the *Pope*'s Supremacy in its Government, nor the *Trent* Creed in its Worship; and consequently it is Ignorance and Malice to the hight, to charge it with *Popery*.

I here subjoin *the special* Profession of *Pius* IV. *which proceeds in these Words*:

'1. I most firmly admit and embrace the Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and the rest of the *Observations* and *Constitutions* of the same Church.

'2. I do also admit the *Sacred Scripture*, according to that Sense which our holy 'Mother, the Church, hath held, and doth hold, to whom it belongs, to judge of 'the true Sense and the Interpretation of the sacred Scriptures: Nor will I ever take 'or interprete it, but according to the unanimous Consent of the *Fathers*.

'3. I profess also, that there are truly and properly *Seven Sacraments* of the New 'Law, *instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord*, and necessary for the Salvation of Mankind; 'though not all for every one. *Scil.* Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penitence, 'Extream Unction, Order and Matrimony; and that they confer Grace; and that of 'these, Baptism, Confirmation and Order, cannot be reiterated with Sacriledge.

'4. I do also receive and admit the received and approved *Rites* of the Catholick 'Church, in the solemn Administration of all the Sacraments aforesaid.

'5. I embrace and receive all, and every the Things, which, concerning *Original Sin* 'and *Justification*, have been defined and declared in the holy Synod of *Trent*.

'6. I profess likewise, That in the Mass is offered unto God, a true, proper and 'propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead; and that in the most holy Sacra-'ment of the Eucharist is truly, really and substantially the Body and Blood, together 'with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a Conversion 'of the whole Substance of Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of the 'Wine into the Blood; which Conversion, the Catholick Church calls *Transubstan-'tiation*.

'7. I confess also, That in one Kind only is Christ whole and entire, and a true Sa-'crament received.

'8. I constantly hold, That there is a *Purgatory*; and that the Souls there detain-'ed, are helped by the Prayers of the Faithful: Likewise also, That the *Saints* reign-'ing together with Christ, are to be venerated and invok'd; and that they offer Prayers 'to God for us; and that their Relicks are to be had in Veneration.

'9. I most firmly assert, that the *Images* of Christ, and of the Blessed Virgin, Mo-'ther of GOD, and also of other Saints, ought to be had and retained; and that 'due Honour and Veneration ought to be given to them.

'10. I affirm also, that a Power of *Indulgences* was left by Christ in the Church, 'and that the Use of them is very helpful to the Christian People.

'11. I acknowledge the Holy Catholick and Apostolick *Roman Church*, the *Mother* 'and *Mistress* of all *Churches*; and I *promise and swear* true Obedience to the Bishop of '*Rome*, the Successor of Blessed *Peter*, Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of *Jesus* '*Christ*.

'12. I also receive and profess without doubt all other Things delivered, defined 'and declared by S. *Canons*, *Oecumenical Councils*, and especially by the H. *Synod* of '*Trent*; and all Things contrary thereunto, and all Heresies whatsoever condemned 'and rejected, and anathematized by the Church, I likewise condemn, reject and 'anathematize.

'This true Catholic Faith, *out of which none can be saved*, which at present I freely 'profess, and truly hold, *I N.* do promise, vow and swear most constantly (GOD 'assisting) to retain and profess the same entire and inviolate to the last Breath of 'my Life; and that I will take Care, as far as I shall be able, that it be held, taught 'and preach'd by my Subjects, or those, of whom the Care belongs to me in my Of-'fice: So help me GOD, and the Holy Gospels of GOD.

Digitized by Google

And now, Good Reader, when the Controverſy anent the true Notion of Popery is thus clearly ſtated; who ſhould not lament the ſad Condition of the poor miſled People, who are under the Tutory of falſe Teachers, who cry out againſt the Book of Common-Prayer as Popiſh? Who ſhould not pity them who are depriv'd of a ſound and ſolid Worſhip, and are fed with nothing but Husks and Traſh, the dark and ſowr Principles of the Nonſenſe and Blaſphemy of Enthuſiaſtick Extemporizers? Let every Reader then obſerve, that the true and proper Notion of Popery is, owning the Pope's Juriſdiction and Supremacy over all Kings and Kingdoms, over all Perſons and in all Cauſes; and alſo that the *Trent* Creed is a Partition-Wall betwixt us and the Papiſts. And let it be remembred alſo, for Reaſoning in common Diſcourſe, that the Church of *England* has ſhaken off the Pope's Supremacy, which I told you is the true and proper Notion of Popery: And this ſurely is not the Government of the Church of *England*; neither does it practiſe the *Trent* Creed in its Worſhip. I add to this, that, if we ſhould ſhake off all Things that Papiſts do practiſe, we will be forc'd at laſt to ſeek for a new *Goſpel* and a new *Creed*.

I will here divert the Reader with Two or Three Queſtions, upon the Ignorance of ſome and Malice of others, in ſtating the Queſtion betwixt Papiſts and Proteſtants.

1. Queſt. *Why do Presbyterians account themſelves ſound Proteſtants?*

Anſ. Becauſe they took a Toleration from a Popiſh King, and came in at the ſame Door, and with the ſame Deſign, to ruin the Proteſtant Epiſcopal Church, which was then eſtabliſh'd by Law.

2. Q. *Why do the Presbyterians think themſelves not Popiſh?*

A. Becauſe they would take the Pope's Supremacy and Power to themſelves over all Perſons, and all Cauſes; and they would dethrone Kings, and abſolve Subjects from their Allegiance, who oppoſe their Solemn League and Covenant; as well as the Pope does, for oppoſing his Supremacy and the *Trent* Creed.

3. Q. *Why do they look upon the Church of* England *as Popiſh?*

A. Becauſe it gainſtands the Pope's Supremacy, and hath nothing of the *Trent* Creed in its Worſhip.

There are ſeveral Things mentioned by the by, in this *Section*, by M. *A.* which ſhall be examined in a Number by themſelves; as for Examples, *p.* 23. he vindicates that Expreſſion, (*The Impertinencies of the Epiſtles and Goſpels*) ſaying, Is it not impertinent to read the 40 of *Iſa.* for the Epiſtle of St. *John*? Does not (ſays he) every one know, theſe are not Epiſtles? To this we anſwer, That the Book of *Common Prayer* does not call them Epiſtles, but ſay the 40th of *Iſa.* is read for the Epiſtle, that is, inſtead of the Epiſtle. Had not this Author good will to quibble againſt the Liturgy, when he made this an Objection againſt it?

2*do.* He ſays, that I palpably miſrepreſent the Author of the *Caſuiſtical Eſſay*, Mr. *Hog* by Name: Whereas I repeat his own very Words, *pag.* 318. thus, *The frequent ſaying of the Lord's Prayer, is turning it into a Lifeleſs, ſapleſs, and loathſom Worſhip.* Again, *pag.* 320---- *The concluding with theſe Words, rather than at any other Time, is an Engine of Hell, not only far contrary to the Divine Preſcript, but likewiſe ſubverſive of the Goſpel of Chriſt.*

Yea, he tells us, that he doubts not of the Concurrence of thoſe that are exerciſed in Godlineſs, to ſay with him. Now either M. *A.* is Godly or Ungodly: If he be Godly, he'll ſay with Mr. *Hog*; if he be Ungodly, he'll diſſent from him. And really I think the Ungodly right upon this Point.

Again, *pag.* 27. he endeavours to free the *Presbyterians* from the Murther of King *Charles* I. But the *Solemn League* and *Covenant*, the *Act* of the *Weſt-Kirk*, and the Penitentials of the Synod of *Aberdeen*, &c. will demonſtrate to the World, who had the direct Hand in that barbarous and bloody Tragedy.

Again, *pag.* 29. *Hippolitus* his Opinion of the Devil's being the Anti-Chriſt, is as good Senſe as is ſpoken upon the Head.

All theſe Points ſhall be treated in a Number by themſelves.

Digitized by Google

Of the Reading of the Apocrypha.

PAGE 30. You cannot let pass that Mistake in citing the 6th *English* Canon, instead of the 6th Article, *viz.* That the Apocrypha Books *are read not to prove any Point of Faith*, but very instructive for Morals: And for this, the 6th Article cites St. *Jerome*'s Authority.

I added also, That these Books were not read upon *Sundays*: And I told, That what is omitted to be read in Scripture, is no Disadvantage to any Article of Faith. And I wish, the People were first principled in the Fundamentals of the *Creed* (of which they're generally ignorant) before they troubled their Heads with Chronologies, Genealogies, legal Sacrifices, and Catalogues of *Hebrew* Names and Places, obscure and dark Places of Scripture, which are abstruse to the Clergy as well as to the Laity. Withal, the reading of the Chronicles is omitted for another Reason; and that because (for the most part) the Matter contained in them, is to be found in the Books of *Samuel* and of the *Kings*. The Mistake of putting in *Canon* for *Article*, was mine; and yet you say, That I had it out of Dr. *Falconer*; which when I lookt to, I found him right, and my self in the wrong: So that I could not have it out of him. If I made a Noise of that gross Error in your Title-Page, *Crimine ex uno disce omnes*, I was in the wrong; because I cannot impute it to Ignorance, but to Mistake.

Page 31. Thou calls it *bordering upon Blasphemy*, that I should have said, *That the People are more edified by the reading the* Apocryphal *Books, than by the* Chronicles, *and other omitted Places.* This you call, A preferring an human Composure to divine Inspiration: And you add, That the 17th Chapter of the 1 *Chronicles*, is more edifying than the half of the *Apocrypha*. And then thou mentions *Tullie*'s *Offices*, *Seneca*, *Plato*, *Horace*, *Jamblicus*, *Juvenal*: Not one of all these (say you) but is more instructive than the *Apocrypha*, frequently more sound Divinity, and always more elegant.

I here intreat the Attention of the judicious Reader. He tells the 17 of the 1. *Chron.* is more edifying than the half of the *Apocrypha*: Words befitting a Deist or an Atheist, who prefers Heathen Authors who *were Aliens from the Common-Wealth of Israel*, to the Writings of Holy Men, who were Members of God's Church, which comes next to the inspired Writings, and Canonical Books of the Old-Testament, and written according to the Doctrine of the Law and Prophets Writings! for which primitive Fathers and Councils had a vast Deference; and which the learn'dest of Presbyterians have in high Veneration, as being written with such an Air of the Spirit of God, and so conform to the inspir'd Writings, that 'tis surprising to hear any go under the Name of a Christian, express himself at such a Rate. They are written in a majestick, lofty, feeling and humble Stile; and in some Places prophetick of the *Messias*, as 2 *Esd.* 7 *Chap.* 8. Sir, pray be ingenuous and tell me, did you ever read the first Ten Chapters of the 1 Book of the *Chron.* or lecture on them, to your Auditory? Tell me, what would that signify to an Auditory to read *Hebrew* Names of Persons and Places, Genealogies or Mystical Chapters, which the Clergy cannot expound? Yea, and to an Auditory that is ignorant of the plain Points of the Christian Religion? Are not Mr. *Hugh Binning*'s Sermons upon the Fundamentals of Christianity, more profitable than the reading of some Chapters, which the People no more understand than they do *Hebrew* or *Greek*? I shall allow the moral Discourses of the Heathens upon God & Providence, Mortality & Happiness, very edifying; & I think that which we call natural Religion, is Divinity, as well as reveal'd Religion: But to compare the Writings of *Horace* to the *Apocrypha*, which are written according to the Canonical Books of the Old-Testament, and not only so, but to make them excel these holy Penmen, is a Piece of avowed Blasphemy. The 17 of the 1 *Chron.* (you say) is worth the half of the *Apocrypha*; but *Horace* is better than all the *Apocrypha*; and consequently *Horace* must be better than the 17 *Chap.* of the 1 *Chron.* which is a Part of the Canonical Scriptures. All Truths are Truths, but not of equal Importance; that St. *Paul* left a Cloak at *Troas*, is true; yet not so necessary to be preached upon as the *Incarnation*, *Nativity*, *Death*, and *Resurrection* of *Christ*. So all the Chapters in the Bible are Canonical Scripture; but not equally edifying, nor equally fit to be read to a common Auditory.

When

Digitized by Google

When I told you Pag. 17 in my Pamphlet, That you prefer your own Discourses, and make them to be more edifying than the Word of God; and that from both your *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms* in that *Question*. How is the Word made effectual to Salvation? *Ans. The Spirit of God maketh the Reading, but especially the Preaching of the Word an effectual Mean of convincing and converting Sinners*, &c. Thou was pleased to pass this by: Sir, it is too choaking for thee. Now to have your own Compositions mixt but too much with Ignorance, false Maxims, and false Doctrine, Fancies and your own Explanations of Scripture which favour the Corruptions of Nature, and to neglect the reading of the Scriptures, which is truly preaching according to the 15. Chap: of the *Acts* 21, 22. and to accuse us for omitting some few Chapters, which are not so edifying for ordinary Hearers, is a most unaccountable Piece of Impudence.

Next when I tell, That the *Jews* did not read all the Scriptures; that the *Hagiogr.* were omitted; yet Christ did not desert their Communion: *What then*, says thou, *are we obliged to imitate the* Jewish *Fooleries?* Nor did He desert their Communion, for the ungodly Doctrine of the *Corban*, or preferring their own Traditions to the Commandments of God. Sir, He did not reprove the one, but the other He rebuked severely. Was not this Answer obvious to thy self: But thou art resolved to be still contentious. Let him then that is wilful be wilful still: 'Tis not for Truth, but for Triumph thou contends; but that thou'lt never obtain in the Judgment of rational Christians. The *Jews* read an Hundred Times more Scripture than you do, and we read Six Times more than they; and yet thou still snarles against the most rational and most edifying Church in the World.

When I tell, That the primitive Christians read other Writings beside the inspir'd. Thou answers like thy self, *What then? I should prove that they omitted the reading of the Canonical Scriptures, to make Way for these.* I answer, They did not omit the reading of Canonical Scriptures; it is presum'd they did what was rational and edifying; and that many Places of Canonical Scripture were not so edifying, to a Vulgar Auditory as the *Apocrypha*, which were the Ecclesiastical Writings in the *Old Testament*, as the Epistles, of *Barnabas*, *Hermas*, *Ignatius*, &c. are the Ecclesiastical Writings in the *New Testament*.

Thou tells us also, That *the primitive Christians had a Custom of cramming the Eucharist down Infants Throats upon a mistaken Interpretation of the* 6. S. Joh. 53. *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man*, &c. *This*, say you, *was the Practice of* Cyprian's *Time*; but how long before thou dost not know. And yet Page 43. thou says, That *the use of the Cross was not more early than giving the Eucharist to Infants*. This is a gross Mistake, for you read not the giving the Communion to Infants more early than S. *Cyprian*, as I think *Musculus* in his common Places (I have not the Book at Hand) tells, was a Custom in *Lorain*, whereas we read of the Cross, an Hundred Years before, and was an universal Practice.

I fear, Sir, there is one Book that misleads you all, as to this Point, and that of a *Diocesan* Bishop, and that's the *Anonymous* Author of *the Enquiry into the Constitution Discipline, Unity, and Worship, that flourish'd within the first* 300 *Years after Christ*, Part 2. Page 26 and 146. which says the very same thing that thou says. But this will not import, that giving the Euchaaist to Infants, was as universal a Custom as the Sign of the Cross, or the reading of the *Apocrypha*. We have (for ought I can learn) S. *Cyprian* and some few others after his Time reporting it.

Poor *Tobit*, must not escape without a Lash of thy Pen, and not one Word to the Answer I have given. But it is sure, he was no *Whigg*: He held by the *Aaronical* Succession, in opposition to *Jeraboam's* new upstart Kirk and his Ordinationless Priests. *Tob.* 1, 2, 3. The ancient Fathers had another Opinion of *Tobit* than thou; St. *Cyprian* in his Book of *Alms*, calls it Scripture: The Spirit of God (saith the Father) says, *That by Alms and Faith Sins are done away*. And St. *Ambrose* in his Book on *Tobit* 1 Chap. calls this Book, Prophetical Scripture. St. *Basil* in his Oration against Covetousness, citing a Sentence out of *Tobit*, calls it a divine Precept. I told Page 19. what was objected against the Book of *Tobit*, to which I refer my Reader; for there is not one Word of it answered, and Page 171. 20.

The History of the Idol *Bel* and *Dragon*, that it is neither impossible nor improbable it should be a true Narration; and more are of the Mind it is, than that it is false. I told also, That the History of the Idol *Bel* and *Dragon*, was cited by *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Cyprian*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, as a true History. And again, as I said,

Digitized by Google

ſaid, allow it to be a Parable; the Morality is, That thoſe who promote Superſtition and Idolatry, uſe Tricks and Legerdemain to ſupply the want of better Arguments. And this is a Caution to the People, not to be eaſily impoſed upon by their own Credulity and the Sophiſtry and Artifice of intereſted Perſons. To this you ſay, *If a Parable that has a good Moral may be brought into the Chriſtian Worſhip, why not Æſop's Fables?* The Reaſon is, becauſe thoſe Books are Eccleſiaſtical Writings by Men in the Church of God; and the other written by Heathens. I added to all, That ſeveral Books in the New Teſtament have been doubted as to their being Canonical, as much as ever the *Apocrypha*.

Then, Sir, you'll have the Son of *Sirach* wrong, whether we will or not. But here I muſt repeat the Words *Eccleſiaſticus* 12. 5. which thou calls a wicked Precept: *Do well unto him that is lowly, but give not unto the ungodly, hold back thy Bread and give it not unto him, leſt he overmaſter thee thereby; for elſe thou ſhalt receive twice as much evil for all the good thou haſt done to him.* Is not this capable of a very pious Senſe, that we are not to give to the Wicked to uphold him in his Wickedneſs? St. *Paul* ſaith, that *he that worketh not, ſhould not eat*: But thou makes the Words of *Eccleſiaſticus* to contradict St. *Paul* in *Rom.* 12. 20. *If thine Enemy*, &c. How could he contradict the Apoſtle who was not then in being? Hadſt thou ſaid *Solomon*, *Prov.* 25. 22. thou had ſpoke ſome Senſe; but I'm ſure the Son of *Sirach* underſtood the Writings of *Solomon* better than either you or I, or any Divine in the Nation, having better Occaſion to know the Cuſtoms and Phraſeologies of the Country where the Scripture was written. And we have that ſame Commentary thou gives, *of heaping Coals of Fire*, borrowed from the Metallers, in the *Engliſh* Notes upon the Place.

Thou'lt alſo have the Wiſeman to contradict himſelf in *Eccleſiaſticus* 38, firſt 14 Verſes, where he ſpeaks honourably of the Phyſician; and yet in Verſe 15. ſaith, *He that ſinneth before his Maker, let him fall into the Hand of the Phyſician.* I told, that *this Evil was of the Patient; and not of the Phyſician.* Now let all the Phyſicians of Soul and Body be Judges, whether or not the Son of *Sirach* contradicts himſelf. Would any Man in his right Senſes contradict himſelf ſo ſuddenly, to ſpeak well of the Phyſician in 14 plain Verſes, and then in the very next Verſe overturn all that he had ſaid? But a Turn muſt be ſerv'd, right or wrong.

Page 34. thou tells us, *That the* Revelation *ſhould be read, becauſe Chap.* 1. *it is ſaid, Bleſſed is he that readeth*, &c. Thou tells, *My Anſwer to that is downright Blaſphemy, becauſe I ſaid, which if true*; then by the Rule of Contraries, they are curſed that do not read it. I added alſo in my Book, Then what ſhall become of thoſe Kirkmen, that neither read it, nor any Part of Canonical Scriptures?

But, Sir, where lies the Blaſphemy, in the Words, *which if true*? This was not ſaid by me, doubting that theſe Words were Scripture; but doubting the Uſe that thou made of it; to wit, That this myſterious Book, by vertue of thy Citation, ſhould be read to a vulgar Auditory, who are not principled in the plain Beginnings of Religion: I ſaid not ſo, as coming from the Spirit of God, but as coming from thy Spirit, and the Uſe that thou made of it. *This is my Body*, coming from the Mouth of a Papiſt with a Popiſh Meaning, is falſe: Theſe Words, *Laying on the Hands of the Presbytery*, rehears'd by a Presbyterian, is falſe, tho' the Scriptures be true. God's Sword in the Devils Hand, and God's Word in the Devil's Mouth, are not likely to do good. The Devil repeated Scripture, but to ill purpoſe. I gave a ſatisfying Anſwer to theſe Words from Mr. *Baxter*, to which I refer my Reader.

I ask thee in the *Revelation* as *Philip* ask'd the Eunuch, *Underſtandeſt thou what thou readeſt?* If thou does not underſtand, how ſhould your Creedleſs, Lord's-Prayerleſs People underſtand? And either thou canſt, or canſt not interpret that myſtical Book: If thou can give the true Meaning of the Spirit, why does thou not oblige the World by ſetting forth a Commentary upon it? Mr. *Calvin*'s Modeſty, and his Senſe of his Weakneſs for ſuch a Performance, made him forbear to write upon it, tho' he commented on all the Scriptures beſides; for which *Scaliger* reckons it as wiſe a Thing as ever he did: If thou cannot give the true Meaning of it, why ſhould Time be ſpent in Aſſemblies upon it, when they have much more Work ado in a ſhort Time, for edifying the Ignorants in the plain Truths of Chriſtianity?

I know, ſome of your Gang will take their Dreams and Deluſions upon this Book for Interpretations; as a Lady that told my ſelf in 1682, when the Duke of *York* was in the Kingdom, upon *Revel.* 18. 15. *The Merchants of theſe Things which were made*

rich

Digitized by Google

rich by her, &c. that this was, The Incoming of Popery; for the Duke of *York* was a great Merchant. She told me alſo, That her old Presbyterian ghoſtly Father approved of that Interpretation.

Some of your Whigg Countrymen, that are ſo far from having learned their ſecond Part of the Grammar, as your *Countryman* with the *Curate* has done in the Dialogue, that can neither read nor write in their Mother Tongue, yet will adventure to Lecture. To this Purpoſe; I heard a Story of one of your Country Teachers at the Examination of a Parochiner, who ask'd him, If he pray'd in his Family? He told, he did. He ask'd, If he read? He told, he could not read himſelf; but his Wife read a Chapter, and he himſelf lectur'd upon it, and expounded it.

In the laſt Place, after I had diſcuſſed thy Objection againſt the old and new Verſion of the 105 *Pſalm* 28, and ſpent the moſt Part of the 21 Page to clear it, and I cite *Capellus*, *Pool*'s *Synopſis*, *Fuller*'s *Miſcel.* *Junius* and *Tremelius*, and ſhew that the Verſion in the Liturgy is agreeable to the greateſt Number of *Latin* Copies in St. *Auguſtine*'s Time, and to the *Septuagint*, expreſſing it thus, *And they were not obedient to his Word*; meaning the *Egyptians*: And that it is reconcilable to the *Hebrew* Text, if the Word *Not* be admitted to include an Interrogation; and ſo it will run thus, *And did they not rebel againſt his Word?* Compare this with *Exod.* 8. 21. where the Word *Not* is taken by way of Queſtion. Again, *they rebelled not againſt his Word*; that is, either *Moſes*, *Aaron*, or the *Iſraelites*. And yet thou impudently tells me, that all the Anſwer I give is, That the Old Tranſlation is preferable to the New.

It is not the firſt time that the Laſt Tranſlation has been made worſe than the Firſt by thoſe of thy Party; witneſs the Bibles printed by Mrs. *Anderſon* 1679 and 1685; where inſtead of the Words, *Whom WE may appoint over this Buſineſs*, Acts 6. 3. the People are made to read, *Whom YE may appoint*, &c. I have heard, that in the Time of *Oliver*, there was a Deſign ſet on Foot for a new Tranſlation; and where ever the Word *King* was, to tranſlate it *Parliament*; ſo the Book of *Kings*, was the Book of *Parliaments*; *David* King of *Iſrael*, *David* the Parliament of *Iſrael*, becauſe he was the Mr. Speaker: But one wiſer than the reſt, asked, What ſhall you do with *Iſa.* 30. 33. *Tophet of old is prepared for Kings?* Will ye tranſlate it, *Prepared for Parliaments?* This one Objection marr'd the whole Deſign of a New Tranſlation.

Advertiſement.

The Myſtery of Phanaticiſm,

The Contents of which, are, viz.

1. Their great Zeal in making Proſelytes. 2. Their Pretence to greater Light and Knowledge than other Men. 3. Their Pretence to greater Strictneſs and Sanctity than other Men. 4. Their Pretence to purer Ordinances, and a more Spiritual Way of Worſhip. 5. Of their crying up Peace and Unity, tho' all their Actions tend to deſtroy and undermine them. 6. Their Cenſuring the Lives and Actions of thoſe within the Church, the better to commend theirs who Diſſent from it. 7. Of their calling the wiſe Injunctions of our Superiors, by the odious Name of Impoſitions. 8. Of their keeping the People in Ignorance of the Nature and Danger of Schiſm. 9. Of their Miſinterpreting and Wreſting the Scriptures to ſerve their own Purpoſe. 10. Their confining the Offices of Kindneſs and Charity to thoſe of their own Sect. 11. Their working upon the Weakneſs, the Wilfulneſs, and Diſcontent of the People, to ſerve their own Ends upon them. 12. Their Pretence to Chriſtian Liberty. 13. Their Pretence to better Means of Edification. 14. Their ſetting up and encouraging little private Schools of Philoſophy. 15. Their ſettling and maintaining a ſecret Correſpondence among themſelves; with a Copy of one of their late Letters. Sold at *James Watſon*'s Shop, next Door to the *Red-Lyon*, oppoſite to the *Lucken-booths*. Price Sixpence.

Edinburgh, Printed by JAMES WATSON. 1712.

Digitized by Google

Of Vain Repetitions.

I Told you, there is a Difference betwixt Repetitions and vain Repetitions, as there is betwixt Philoſophy and vain Philoſophy; ſo that every Repetition is not vain, more than every Philoſophy: The Inſtance you give of the Prieſts of *Baal*, 1 *Kings* 18. 26. is moſt impertinently applied to the Book of Common-Prayer: To ſay, that the Repetitions therein are vain, becauſe *Baal*'s Prieſts cryed from Morning until Noon, *O Baal hear us.* At the ſame Rate you may object vain Repetitions to the Prophet *Elijah* verſ. 37. *Hear me, O Lord, hear me.* But you'll ſay, that they continued ſo to pray from Morning till Evening; and how know you, but the Prophet did ſo too?

Thou tells me, that the uſing vain Repetitions in the Original, is to *Battologize*, and that any Country School-maſter will make me underſtand the Story of *Battus*; but really, you who have been a City School-maſter, has not done it yet; eſpecially when you make it ſignify a Repetition of the ſame Words, as are in the Book of Common-Prayer, for which there is Scripture Example. Whereas it is a multiplying of Words to the ſame Purpoſe, changing the Phraſes, in Oppoſition to *Laconiſm*, or a ſhort Way of ſpeaking pertinently in few Words, like Men's extemporary Prayers, which continue two or three Hours on end. Dr. *Hammond* tells us in his Catechiſm, that the Heathens had that Opinion of their Gods, that by much ſpeaking they made their Gods underſtand their Meaning: So that the Redundance of Words, to the ſame Purpoſe with a falſe Conception of a Deity, is forbidden by our Saviour; and not ſaying the ſame individual Words, which the Angels have in Heaven, *Holy, Holy, Holy.* If the *Baalites* Prayer had been addreſt to the true God, in Faith and Fervency, it had not been a vain Repetition to reiterate the ſame Words, more than it was in the Prophet *Elijah*, to have ſaid, *Hear me, O Lord, hear*, nor in the words of 22 *Joſh.* 22. *The Lord God of Gods, The Lord God of Gods*, &c: Repetitions expreſs the Force of our Affections. As *David*, 2 *Sam.* 18. 33. *O my Son Abſolom, my Son, my Son Abſolom* ----- *O, Abſolom my Son, my Son.* 24 *Iſa.* 16. *My Leanneſs, my Leanneſs, Wo unto me, the treacherous Dealers have dealt treacherouſly, yea the treacherous Dealers have dealt very treacherouſly.* I cannot ſee, why there may not be Repetitions in Praiſes, Prayers and Exhortations without being charg'd with Vanity. For Praiſes, we have 136 Pſalm, and theſe Words 26 Times repeated: But you make this but a Rhetorical Ornament to flouriſh Poetical Expreſſions, and not a Mean to rouſe the Affections to a rapturous Joy and Senſe of God's Mercies, and not think that we can inform God, who knows our Neceſſities before we ask; and if this be lawful in Praiſe, why not in Petition for Grace and Pardon?

And why not in Exhortation, as, *O Earth, Earth, Earth*, hear the Word of the Lord, 22 *Jerem.* 29?

Chriſt pray'd the ſame Words thrice, 26 *Mat.* 39. He pray'd, ſaying, *O my Father, if it be poſſible*, &c. which Prayer was heard, 5 *Heb.* 7. *Who in the Days of his Fleſh offered up Prayers with ſtrong Cryings and Tears*, and was heard in that he fear'd.

Mat. 26. He went away again the ſecond Time, and pray'd, *O my Father*, &c. *verſ.* 44. And pray'd the Third Time, ſaying the ſame Words. Your Anſwer to this is, that the Tranſlation ſhould be the ſame Word: Be it ſo, and why might not he pray the ſame Word the third Time, which he pray'd the ſecond Time, being heard in the firſt Prayer.

You tell, that *the manner of Perſons praying in an Agonie, is not to be made a Standard for daily Prayers in a promiſcuous Multitude.* This is no good Divinity, nor a Rule for poor Supplicants, who know not when they may die, and who ſhould knock in earneſt to make their Affections go along with their Words, to obtain the Bleſſing which they want, and to divert the Evil which they deſerve.

You quarrel that Petition in the Litany, *That God may preſerve all that travel by Land or by Water*, for you think that *Pyrates and Buccaneers ſhould be excepted.* I told, that theſe ſhould be pray'd for in the Senſe that we pray, that *God may have Mercy upon all Men.* I told the Senſe of the Word *(All)*; but this and many other things thou never touches: So that my Book ſtands unanſwer'd, for all thou haſt ſaid againſt it or me.

Of

Digitized by Google

Of Baptiſmal Regeneration.

AS to Baptiſmal Regeneration, there is not one Word of my Book anſwered to purpoſe, which I refer to the Reader: But becauſe it is not in every one's Hand, I ſhall reiterate the moſt material Things which my Adverſary never touches. I told, that our Saviour's Deſign of admitting Members into His Church, was to put them into a State of Salvation, by an eaſy Covenant; and, by this federal Regeneration, Men may be ſav'd, if they be not wanting to themſelves, or forfeit their *Happineſs, by Schiſm, Hereſie, juſt Excommunication, or living in an Habit or Love of Sin.*

He tells me, That I omitted his Inſtance of *Simon Magus, That all are not Spiritually regenerate who are baptiz'd.* To this I anſwer, That *Simon* might be regenerate, and yet loſe that Grace, as *Adam* loſt his Innocence. This new Nature is given to all, that do not oppoſe it themſelves, which Infants cannot do, and conſequently are ſav'd, if they die before they commit actual Sin; it is ſuch that are fitted to go to *Chriſt*; it is of ſuch that *His Kingdom is made up.*

In this Regeneration the Spirit is given to War againſt the Fleſh, tho' the Motions of the Fleſh be not altogether extirpate, for there is a perpetual War betwixt the Fleſh and the Spirit.

You tell, *That baptiz'd Perſons ſhew themſelves the Children of the Devil*, which I acknowledge; and for which the *Children of the Kingdom ſhall be caſt into utter Darkneſs: For every Branch in Chriſt that doth not bring forth Fruit is caſt into the Fire*, and ſuch Perſons are preſum'd to have ſufficient Means to bring forth the *Fruits of the Spirit, and Fruits meet for Repentance.* But how wilt thou reconcile thy ſelf with thy Brethren, who affirm, that a State of Grace is conſiſtent with the moſt ſcandalous Sins, Schiſm, Rebellion, Perjury, Murther, Drunkenneſs, Adultery, *&c.*? Doctor *Pierce*, in his *Diſcoverer diſcovered*, P. 62, 63, 64, againſt Mr. *Baxter*, adduces ſeveral Inſtances of this Nature, and gives an Account of a certain godly Woman, who confeſs'd frankly, that ſhe had committed Adultery, and told, it was a great Sin in the Graceleſs, but not in her, that had Grace. The *Marrow of Modern Divinity* maintains ſuch Doctrine as this. We have heard of ſome lately who preach'd ſuch Divinity as this, *That God was as well pleaſed with* David, *when he was committing his Adultery, as when he was making his Pſalms.*

When I told, out of the *Dialogue betwixt the* Country-Man *and the* Curate; that he made his Curate to be ignorant of the Doctrine of *Regeneration*, that it was in the Service Book; and that it was a Jeſt to make a Weſt Country Man know it, and the Curate that was us'd with the *Book of Common-Prayer*, not to know that it was in the Book which he carried ſtill in his Pocket.

To this thou anſwers, *That if Curates of the firſt Character be found thus ignorant, then you hope the Jeſt is ſpoild:* For this you inſtance Dr. *Berrie* in his Lectures, Lect. 7. in theſe Words, *But then all who are the Children of God in the Senſe of the Scripture, or of your Catechiſm, are not actually thus regenerate*, &c. What follows from theſe Words? that Dr. *Berrie* was ignorant of the *Book of Common-Prayer*, as you make your perſonate Curate to be? It may follow, that he has a different Sentiment from other Doctors, but not that he was ignorant of the *Book of Common-Prayer.*

I cited St. *Aug.* de peccat. merit. & remiſſ. lib 3 c. 5. to prove, That *it was the Doctrine of the ancient Church, that baptized Infants, dying before they commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly ſaved.* His Words are, *of old* the whole Church firmly held, *that little Children of the Church of Chriſt, do obtain Remiſſion of Sin, by the Baptiſm of Chriſt.*

I cited alſo *Andr. Rivet* Cathol. Orth. *Tract.* 3. *Queſt.* 3. *Sect.* 1, to this Purpoſe, ſaying, that *There is no Proteſtant, who doth not approve of that of* Aquinas 12æ Queſt. & Art. 3. *that original Sin is taken away as to the Guilt thereof.* And Sect. 9. he ſaith *it is moſt falſe, that* Calvin *and* Beza *ever ſaid, that ſome baptiz'd Infants are damn'd, dying in their Infancy before they commit actual unrepented of.* All this is paſt over in Silence, and anſwered with Banter and Scolding.

And to ſhew, that the Church of England ſays no other Thing upon this Head of Regeneration, I did ſet down the *Weſtminſter* larger Catechiſm's Definition of the Sacrament of Baptiſm.

Baptiſm

Digitized by Google

Baptiſm is a Sacrament of the New-Teſtament, wherein Chriſt hath ordained the Waſhing with Water in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghoſt, to be a Sign and Seal of ingrafting us into himſelf, of Remiſſion of Sins by his Blood, and Regeneration by his Spirit, of Adoption and Reſurrection into everlaſting Life, and whereby the Parties baptized are ſolemnly admitted into the viſible Church, and enter into open and profeſs'd Engagements to be the Lord's.

Now Courteous Reader, be pleas'd to judge ingenuously, what Sort of Man I have to deal with, that paſſes by ſuch plain Arguments, and anſwers me with ſuch Language as a Lyar, Ignorant, Nonſenſick Blunderer, Blaſphemer, *&c.* and keeps up the Cauſe of his Party with ſuch Methods.

Of the Sign of the Croſs in Baptiſm.

SIR,

THOU here tells me, that I cite St. *Cyprian*'s Saying with Approbation thus, *The Croſs completes every Sacrament, and Baptiſm is ſanctified by the Sign of the Croſs.* To this thou Anſwers, *That if the Sign of the Croſs ſanctifies Baptiſm, then it is greater than Baptiſm*, by our Saviour's Argument, *viz. The Altar that ſanctifies the Gold is greater than the Gold.* Sir, thou might know, that to *Bleſs* and to *Sanctify* in Scripture Stile has diverſe Significations. We read 7. *Heb.* 7. that *without all Contradiction the leſs is bleſſed of the better*, and yet Man is ſaid to bleſs God, *that is, to ſpeak well of Him.* Again, Man is ſaid to *ſanctifie the Lord*, 20. *Numb.* 12. 8. *Iſ.* 12, 13. 1 St. *Peter* 3. Ch. 14. that is, to *acknowledge his Juſtice*, to *believe his Truth*, and Almighty Power, and have an awful Reverence of Him upon our Hearts. Thus St. *Cyprian* ſpeaks of the Croſs in Baptiſm, and yet thou, with a *N. B.* on the Margin of thy Book, ſays, That I adduc'd not one Teſtimony for the Sign of the Croſs in Baptiſm. Pray what is more clear for it than what St. *Cyprian* ſays?

Page 41. You ſuppreſs my Words to make thy Anſwer more plauſible with the Ignorant, or (perhaps) with the Knowing, who never read my Book. I told, P. 33. That the Sign of the Croſs is uſed when Baptiſm is over: In Baptiſm the Miniſter ſays, *I baptize thee in the Name of*, &c. But in ſigning with the Croſs, he ſays, *We ſign this Child*, &c. ſpeaking in the Name of the Congregation: The firſt is a Dedication, the ſecond a Declaration; ſo, as I told, Chriſt heal'd the Lepers, but he ſent them to the Prieſt for a Declaration of their being cleanſed. I add alſo, that after *Chriſt* was baptized, a Voice was heard from Heaven, ſaying, *This is my beloved Son*, &c. To this you anſwer, *That I betray my Ignorance of the Doctrine of the Church of* England; *particularly of the* 30. *Canon, where the Sign of the Croſs is called a Dedication*, in theſe Words, *Whereby the Infant is dedicated to the Service of Him that died on the Croſs.* I anſwer, The Meaning of that is, the Congregation declares by this Sign, that the Infant is dedicated to Chriſt who died on the Croſs.

When I tell that Presbyterian Prejudices againſt the Sign of the Croſs are grounded upon Two falſe Rules.

The *Firſt* is, that we are to do nothing in the Worſhip of God, but what we have expreſs Warrant from Scripture: You anſwer to this, by way of Parentheſis, *by Way of ſignificant Ceremonies*, or elſe I ſpeak Nonſenſe. And here you denie, that the Church can either make or impoſe ſignificant Ceremonies: Pray! what Ceremonies then can it impoſe? Either none at all, and then where is it's Power in Matters of Diſcipline or Externals in Worſhip? Or it can, and then the Ceremonies muſt be inſignificant according to your Way of reaſoning. But you will allow civil Ceremonies to be ſignificant, as *Earth*, *Stone*, *Heſp*, *Staple*, for Inveſtments of *Houſes or Lands*; but not allow the Church to impoſe Ceremonies, tho' they be not *Jewiſh*, typical, ſuperſtitious nor burdenſome: But few primitive, decent, orderly, rational and pious.

It is moſt malicious to object, that the Church makes it a Sacrament, for 1. it declares, that it is not of divine Inſtitution. 2. That God annex'd no Promiſe of conveying his Grace be Vertue of this Sign, but to the Signs of his own Inſtitution, which are not only Signs but Seals, moral Inſtruments, and Chanels, by which God keeps his Part of the Covenant of Grace, to thoſe that are worthy Receivers, and hinder not the Influence in the Conveyance. The Sacraments are Seals, by which the Spirit marks out his own Wares for the Day of Redemption: And the Church profeſſes, that theſe

are

Digitized by Google

are Sacraments, tho' the Sign of the Croſs be not uſed, as in the Caſe of private Baptiſm.

When I ſay, that it is a falſe Rule, to affirm, that we are to do nothing but what we have expreſs Scripture for; You ſay, *It is a very juſt Rule by our Saviour's Words, In vain do they worſhip Me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.* Now, Sir, does the Church of *England* teach, that the Sign of the Croſs is the Command of God, as Sacraments are? Or, 2. Are all the Commands of Men to be diſobeyed? Then farewel all Laws and Rules in Church and State.

When I ſhew you, how many things your ſelves practiſe, for which you have no Scripture, as for Example, Extemporary and uninſpired Prayers: Your Anſwer is, *That you have Scripture for that, For the Spirit helps your Infirmities:* What do you mean, that the Spirit helps you to make rude, raw, undigeſted extemporary Stuff, which you impoſe upon an ignorant People? Is not this grieving the good Spirit of God?

But you tell me, if I ask Scripture for extemporary Prayer, the Publican that pray'd *Lord have Mercy upon me a Sinner.* I ask again, how know you, that it was *extempore*? that might be his daily Ejaculation before he came to the Temple, for ought you know. But, *Secondly*, That of the Publican is a Parable, from which you cannot infer or warrant extemporary Prayers to a Congregation; for tho' it were a real Hiſtory, the Publican ſaid it to himſelf, and not to a Meeting for Worſhip. You give another Argument for extemporary Prayer, *viz.* the Diſciples in Danger of Ship-Wrack, who cry'd, *Lord ſave us ere we periſh.* Therefore, it follows that People in a Congregation ſhould have extemporary Prayers. But, Sir, remember your own Rule, when it is told to you, that our Saviour repeated the ſame Words thrice, to ſhew you, that all Repetitions are not vain. You tell us, that Prayer in Agony is not to be made a Standard for ordinary Congregations: Pray allow us to argue at the ſame Rate with you. An excellent Argument, becauſe the Diſciples utter'd that ſhort Ejaculation in a terrible Danger, for themſelves only; therefore you muſt pray Two Hours *ex tempore* to a Congregation, which is ignorant of the Fundamentals of Religion, and of what you are to ſay before hand, and as ignorant after your Prayers and Preachings are ended. The Diſciples in a Storm cry'd, *Lord ſave us ere we periſh*, it ſeems all of them had one and the ſame Litany, which is an Argument for a whole Congregation to pray the ſame Words.

When I ask, what Scripture you have for ſinging the *Pſalms* with the Common Tunes? You anſwer, That you do not practiſe that as a myſtical ſignificant Ceremony, as we do the Sign of the Croſs: What then do you call ſinging of *Pſalms* with the common Tunes, in Eight Syllables in one Line, and Six in the other, if they be not Ceremonies? Are not Ceremonies the Outwards of Holy Things? For either they are Ceremonies or Subſtances. If they be Subſtances; Religion cannot be without them. If Ceremonies; they muſt be either ſignificant or inſignificant: If ſignificant, then you cannot quarrel us for the ſignificant Ceremony of the Sign of the Croſs: If inſignificant, then we quarrel you for uſing Ceremonies for nothing.

But were I reſolv'd to quibble, I ſhould prove, that you make ſeveral things more of the Nature of a Sacrament, than we make the Sign of the Croſs. I ſhall inſtance this, of the Common Tunes, where you have an Order or Harmony, a graceful Beauty, which is the external Sign of ſinging with *Grace in your Hearts.* I ſhall ſhew you, that you make your very *ſitting* at the *Euchariſt* another Sacrament differing from that of the *Lord's Supper.* For, *Firſt*, you pretend *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution for it, tho' you do not obſerve the Inſtitution. Again, you give another thing ſignified by your ſitting than *Chriſt* has told to us, and that is, to *ſhew your Privilege with Chriſt*, that you *are His Equals, and joint Heirs with Him*, that you *have Fellowſhip and Communion with Him*, as ſuch who ſit at one Table with Him: So that your Poſture of ſitting is an outward Sign of an inward Grace; and you can vary the Poſture when you pleaſe, ſit croſs-leg'd in a *Turkiſh* Country, and on the Ground, or on your Bellies, if it be the Faſhion of any Country; and why not kneel too, if it be the Faſhion of another Country?

I inſtance another thing, which among you partakes more of an humane Sacrament than the Sign of the Croſs; and that is, your giving Tickets or Tokens at, or before Communions, which is a diſtinguiſhing Action from thoſe that ought not to communicate, and have no Diſpoſition for receiving. *Secondly*, A Sign of the Perſon's being fit to receive after Examination. *Thirdly*, An external Sign of good Order, whereof God is the Author.

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of the Sign of the Croſs in Baptiſm.

I Should here inſtance the *Solemn League and Covenant*, of which you made a real Sacrament, and made it as it came from God Himſelf; but that it is to be the Subject of another Number, perhaps of Two or Three.

The *Second* falſe Rule, that Presbyterians walk by, as it were plain Scripture, is, That Things abus'd to Idolatry and Superſtition ſhould be wholly laid aſide, which is very falſe, not well qualified.

To this you ſay, *That Presbyterians limit that to things indifferent.* And I anſwer, That theſe things may be laid aſide, when the Wiſdom of the Church thinks fit. To this thou ſays, *That it ought to be laid aſide, when it gives Scandal; and thou denies that the Sign of the Croſs, as us'd by the Church of* England, *is indifferent*: *Yea*, thou ſays, *that it cannot be retain'd without Sin.*

To which I anſwer, That the Church of *England* does not pretend, that it is of Divine Inſtitution, but a profitable, ancient and ſignificant Church-Cuſtom; and that the Church has removed the *Romiſh* Abuſe, and retain'd the ancient and univerſal Uſe. 2. For giving of Scandal, I anſwer, That you ſtill miſtake the true Notion of that Word; for in the Scripture-Stile, it ſignifies, to lay a *ſtumbling Block*, a Snare or Trap in one's Way, (as I hinted at P. 20.) But frequently you take it for provoking to Anger; whereas, I ſhew, that you and your Brethren give Offence, by omitting the *Lord's Prayer*, the *Faſts* and *Feſtivals of the Church*, *&c.* tho' the People be pleas'd with you; and we give no Scandal, tho' they be angry with us.

You add, *That the ſign of the Croſs cannot be retain'd without Sin.* When you offer the leaſt Shadow of a Proof for your ſaying, we ſhall conſider it: But the firſt Chriſtians were not of your Mind.

You tell me, P. 43. when I ſay, that if I take a Liberty to wreſt or ſqueez Scripture, I ſhall ſay more for the Sign of the Croſs in Baptiſm, than you can ſay for Presbytery. You anſwer, *That give you leave to wreſt Stripture, that you ſhall prove all the Points of the* Alcoran. To this I anſwer, *Firſt*, That you (for your own Conveniency) have added to my Words what I did not ſay, to wit, (for the Sign of the Croſs in Baptiſm.) *Secondly*, I anſwer, That I defy you and all your Party to ſay ſo much for Presbytery or for the *Alcoran*, as I can for the Sign of the Croſs: For, *Firſt*, We have the plain Duty of *glorying in the Croſs of Chriſt*, 6 *Gal.* 14. ſet down for our Imitation. And it is as lawful to expreſs this in viſible Signs, as in audible Words, for we know they are remembred when Words are forgotten: And this the Primitive Chriſtians and Martyrs did. As Words then are the Images of our Thoughts, ſo Characters and Signs are the Images of our Words: So that having the very Sound of Scripture-Words backed with the univerſal Practice of the Church, we may lawfully make uſe of a viſible Sign; which was underſtood by the Enemies of Chriſtianity, as well as by them who uſed it, to ſhew, that they were not *aſham'd of the Mockries of Scoffers, nor affraid of the Terrors* of *Tyrants for their Profeſſion.* Nature it ſelf teaches to declare externally, what we profeſs internally, either by Words or Actions. Thus I find *John Knox*, in his Appellation Pag. 23. Vol. 4. expreſs himſelf thus, *That it is the Duty of every Man, who deſireth to eſcape the Plague and Puniſhment of God, to declare himſelf Enemy to Idolatry, not only in Heart, hating the ſame, but alſo in external Geſture*, &c. and ſo 9. *Ezek.*—— *At this time* (ſaith he) *the Lord revealed in Viſion to his Prophet, who they were that ſhould find Favour in that miſerable Deſtruction, to wit, that thoſe that did mourn and lament for all the Abominations done in the City, in whoſe Fore-Heads God did command to print and ſeal* T A U, *to the end that the Deſtroyer ſhould not hurt them in whom that Sign was found.*

But this of *Knox*'s will have as little Weight with you, as St. *Jerom*'s Teſtimony upon the very ſame thing, and which I cited in my Book with other Teſtimonies of the Ancients.

When I cite Scriptures for the Sign of the Croſs, thou tells me, *That* Bellarmin *ſaid all theſe things before me.* I declare, tho' I had *Bellarmin*'s Works in my little Library, I did not make uſe of him, neither was it in the ſame order as thou ſays. And who can write upon the ſame Subject, and not for the moſt Part fall upon the ſame Scriptures relative to that Subject, tho' they never make uſe of the ſame Authors?

When

Digitized by Google

When I cite Fathers, thou asks me, *why all this Waste of thy* Learning in Antiquity especially, *where like the poor Man's Ax, it was borrow'd?* And thou tells me, *thou can tell Page and Leaf*

First, I here give you a bold Defiance, and I shall find you good Security for twenty Guinies, that you cannot: So that if you fail, let the World judge, what sort of Man thou can be in Point of Probity or Conscience, and what Trust can be had to the rest of thy Writings. I want not Fathers in my small Library, and where I want, I acknowledge my Obligation to those whom I take on Trust, both to do them Justice and for my own Security. What I cite, I have not conceal'd, I cited Dr. *Resburie*, and *Elli's Du Pin*. Now for thy Credit, thou art oblig'd to give another Author than I have given my self, otherways in the Judgment of all Persons and Parties (who love the Truth) to undergo the Character of a very wicked Man: But of this more hereafter. But be my Testimonies borrow'd or not, they deserve an Answer; and another sort of an Answer than thou hast given, to wit, *First*, That the Sign of the Cross is not more early than the giving the Eucharist to Infants. To which I answer, That this is not true, for, the First that gives an Account of that, is St. *Cyprian*, who lived in the 3d *Cent.* and thou can go no higher; and then it was no universal Practice, but we shall go above an Hundred Years for the Sign of the Cross.

Again, thou tells, that *the Sign of the Cross is not more early than the working of Antichrist*; so that you would make simple Readers believe, that the Sign of the Cross is the Sign of *Antichrist*, which if it be not, what the worse is it, of its being ancient?

Again, when I ask, if we were in an Heathnish Country, that did not understand our Language, what better Way could we take to shew, that we profess *Christ crucified*, than the visible Sign of the Cross? Among the rest of the Marks thou gives, there is one very odd, and that is, If *an Heathen that did not understand the Christian's Language, heard a Man bid at every Word — Damn him, he would not take him to be the Disciple of the crucified Jesus*, which implies two Things, *First*, That an Heathen understands the Obligations a Christian lies under. *Secondly*, That an Heathen, that does not understand the Christian's Language, should understand his Language, when he bids, *God Damn him*. This would look like a Bull in the Mouth of an *Irish Teague*.

Thou tells us, *that the Egyptians painted the Cross upon the Breast of their God Serapis. Was this a Sign of Christianity?* I answer you, that the Christians had it upon themselves: and mostly on their Foreheads, and not painted upon an Idol.

Secondly, The *Egyptians* had their Hieroglyphicks, that is Characters and Marks for many of their Conceptions, and a Cross, that is, a straight and upright Line, and another Transverse or Thwart, signified sometimes, *the one Upholder of all Things, sometimes Eternal Life*, which was so well known to the Worshippers of *Serapis* at *Alexandria*, that when they saw this Figure of the Cross so often us'd by Christians, they did many of them believe, by remembring the ancient Signification of the Cross among them, supposing it was a mysterious Prediction, that the Christians were the Servants of the one true God, and were in the right Way to Eternal Life. See Dr. *Comber* on the *Administration of Baptism*, Sect. 2. Par. 5. citing his Articles for the Verity of this.

As for your Story of a Child, when you was reading *Sueton* with *Grevius* his Notes, he asked whether *Nero* was a Christian, because he carried a Cross in his Hand? Thus (say you) the visible Sign *of the Cross is a fine Mark of a Christian*. I answer, That all the ancient Churches in the World, look'd on it as such, and the best and learndest of the Reformers did, and do so yet, and you will make a Child's Question mock all that ever they thought, said or practic'd: But truly the Child was pertinent, and you made a very ill Use of his Question; you might have told him, that the Sign of the Cross was not in the Hand of a Christian, but in their Foreheads which they often sign'd with the Hand. The Child was very well inform'd, that it was a visible Badge that Christians had to signifie their Profession, of *Christ crucified*, and he should not have been put off the Thought. I shall end this Story with another Child, whom you knew, he looking to the Cuts in the Book of Common-Prayer, he told me, *I'll let you see where Christ was crucified.* I asked (*John*) Who crucified him? He answered, The *Whiggs*. And truly I think, you teach the People to crucifie him again, when you utter such an Expression as this, *The mad Doctrine of Passive Obedience.* Is

not

Digitized by Google

not this a rare Character you put on Christ and his Followers, their Principle and Practice? Would such as you be a fit Missionary for an Heathen Country? No wonder then, that you do not wear the Sign of the Cross, when you cry down the Thing, this is signified by it, as Madness.

Sect. 6. *Of Kneeling at the Communion.*

YOU tell, P. 48. *That you expected, that I should prove Kneeling from Scripture, which no Liturgist undertakes.* I told, That the Lord's Supper was a Sacrament to any that receiv'd it, whether Kneeling, Standing or Leaning as the *Jews* did the Passover. I told, That they, who took the Sacrament Kneeling, did take it after the Example of our Saviour, who took the Passover according to the Custom of the time and Place, where he took it, which was Leaning, and not sitting straight, whereas the first Institution was standing, 12. *Exod.*

The Civil Table Posture is what you contend for, tho' the Custom were to sit cross-legg'd, as they do in *Turky*, or any other Country Fashion, if it have not a natural Indecency in it. So tho' it were sitting on the Ground straw'd over with green Rushes, as the wild *Irishes* us'd to feast and entertain one another with Cravats of Rushes about their Necks, which has no natural Indecency, tho' not agreeable to *British* Fashions.

That the Communion should be taken according to the Fashion of every Country at their Common Tables is a new Rule, which I never heard Authority for from the Primitive Christians or learned Reformers; and yet our *Scots* Presbyterians stick be it, as if it were an infallible Oracle from Heaven, or as if Christ had said, *Take this Sacrament in the Posture of a Table-Gesture, whatever it be in different Countries, wherever it is administred or received.* The Anabaptists Argument against *Infant Baptism*, is ten times stronger, to wit, *That Christ was 30 Years before he was baptiz'd*, that he was baptiz'd in a River, and not sprinkled; and we find (say they) no plain Instance of *Infant Baptism* in the *New Testament*, yet we think not this enough to overturn the Doctrine or Practice of *Infant Baptism.* I thought there were other Circumstances to debate upon, to be reduc'd to Practice rather than a Common Table Posture; and that is, the giving the Sacrament in the Night time, that it might retain the Propriety of Speech in being called a *Supper*, which is not properly so call'd in the Morning or at Noon. I thought that some might plead first for a Consecration of the Bread, and when that is eaten, to consecrate the Cup afterwards: This our Saviour did, but no Controversy upon this Head. I thought also, that Men might plead for the Sacrament, when they are going to die, or suspect, that their Death is approaching, because our Saviour gave it about the time of his Death. But Presbyterians are so far from following Christ in this Circumstance, that they preach, pray, and make Acts against the giving Communion to dying Persons: But how they come to be so zealous for sitting, which is the least remarkable Circumstance in that Holy Institution, and to make the Country-Fashion the Rule of their Posture, is truly my Admiration. For will it not plainly follow from this, that Christ has commanded no particular Gesture, because every Country-Fashion is the Rule for that Part of it? And I wonder, why not every particular Church Custom as well as Country Custom? And then why did Mr. *John Welsh* separate from the Church of *France*, for giving the Sacrament by Way of Passover? Will it not clearly follow from this, that if the Custom of the Country be our Rule, that we may do somethings for which we have neither Precept nor Example in Holy Scriptures?

There is a Rule which I mention'd P. 36. in expounding of Examples, that, *we must have some Mark or Sign, to know that such or such an Example is the Mind and Will of Christ, and to be perpetually obliging us to the Practice:* But this and many other things are past over in Silence.

Sitting you think so necessary, that the Sacrament cannot be a Sacrament without it. But even as I told you in the former Section, you make a Sacrament of sitting it self, for you tell, that *Sitting is a Sign of Communion and Fellowship and joint Heirship with Christ*; and that the Posture of *Kneeling is too humble for that Preferment, to which you are advanced.* This is hotely contended for by the Author of the *Dispute against Kneeling.* These and such like Notions, by misinterpreted Scriptures, have made

your

Digitized by Google

your Gang indiscreetly familiar with God, even to think with themselves, that it is the Privilege of the Godly to be sawcy.

When I say, that I give a Defiance to all the Party to prove, That Sitting was the Posture, thou answers P. 49. like one in a proud Humility, *that thou art one of the meanest of the Party, and thou will take up my Gauntlet.* Now let us see, how thou hast proven, that Sitting was the Posture in the first Institution of the Lord's Supper? you attempt to do it, P. 50. I shall set down thy very Words and pretended Proofs. *We shall begin with* Matth. 26. *Ch. v.* 20. tells us, *Now when the Even was come, he sat down (to the Passover) with the Twelve: And that we might not dream, there was any other Posture us'd at the Institution of the Supper,* 'tis said V. 26. *And as they were eating, he took Bread,* &c. Therefore (say you) Sitting was the Posture at the *Lord's Supper*, which was at the *Passover.* But Sir, why did you omit the next Words to these, *He took Bread?* you knew very well the next Four Syllables, or Twelve Letters could answer you; and therefore you should have repeated, *and as they were eating, he took Bread,* AND BLESSED IT, &c. So that if your Argument hold Water, it will conclude, that the Disciples were sitting and eating in the time that he was blessing the Sacramental Bread. Did you not foresee, that you would be trac'd for Disingenuity here? What is now become of your peremptory Words, *And that they might not dream, there was any other Posture used?* Did our Saviour consecrate Sitting? You do not this your selves, tho' your Communicants be sitting, when you are giving such a Consecration as is in your Power. Besides, *as they were eating,* will that infer, that they were chewing Meat in the mean time, more than it will infer, that *Judas* had his Hand in the Dish with him in the mean time when Christ said, 26. *Matth.* 23. 14. *Mark* 20. *He that dippeth his Hand with me in the Dish?* that would discover *Judas* immediately. Eating and Drinking doth not always imply the Action, but continuing a Festival, or before the Feast was ended. You cite Bishop *Wettenhall* in his Dedication, and you might have understood that Criticism, he gives 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. *As oft as ye drink,* &c. to be as oft as ye keep an Holy Feast. So that, in Scripture-Stile, Eating and Drinking signifies Feasting; tho' they be not actually Eating or Drinking, but even using other Festival Recreations.

What you have said on the rest of the Evangelists, is not more difficult than what I have already answered.

The Strength of your Argument lies in this, we do not read, that the first Communicants changed their Posture at the Passover. And I answer, neither do we read the contrary; it might be Kneeling for ought you know; Sitting or Leaning for ought I know; and Standing for ought any Man knows: So that the Posture is not of the Essence of the Sacrament.

Page 51. Thou falls foul upon my Dilemma, which runs thus; Either you take the Sacrament in an adoring Posture, or not. You answer, *Not, but in a feasting Posture.* Then I argue, either that is the Posture of a Religious or a Civil Feast? If it be but a Civil Posture to a Religious a Feast, and a Feast upon a Sacrifice, then you take the Sacrament civilly but notreligiously; for Religion implies Adoration. When I say, that if you do not communicate in an adoring Posture, I ask, why then do you communicate with Heads uncovered; which, I told p. 36, is an Act of Adoration, and that before the Elements of Bread and Wine? And so you may be charg'd with Idolatry, according to *Calderwood* and *Rutherfoord*'s Principles, as well as the Papists: But these Words you thought fit to suppress in your Answer. When I ask, why are you uncovered? Your Answer is, *Because it is not a common Table.* Now I ask, Why then do you use a common Gesture another Way? You tell me, I hope, Sir, you would not put on your Hat at a Nobleman's Table; and yet no Man would think you us'd an adoring Posture. A very blessed Comparison! not to make a Difference betwixt *a Lord's Table* and *the Lord's Table.* You sit at *the Lord's Table,* because you are His Equal (as you pretend) by being in Fellowship and Communion with Him; and you keep off your Hat at *a Lord's Table,* because you are not his Equal.

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of Kneeling at the Communion.

PAGE 52. You think you have me in an Hose-Net, when I say, That *the Gesture is not of the Essence of the Sacrament. Thou retorts thus, then why do you,* Scotch *Liturgical Curates, innovate and attempt to bring in a Custom among us, and which bred so much Division in* England? To this I answer, *First*, That you fall into the same Fault which you libelled me for, p. and that not once but twenty Times, and that is using of Retortions: But I pardon that, because I mind to use them, when there is Occasion. And then I answer, That Episcopals us'd Kneeling in *Scotland* before the Revolution (for ought I know) in most Dioceses. *2dly*, We do it in Conformity with the Catholick Church in unquestionable Duties and Decencies; and to distinguish our selves from Schismaticks, who have cut themselves off from the Body of Christ, and whose Pastors have neither Order nor Ordination.

Secondly, say you, *if the Posture be not of the Essence of the Sacrament; why has the Church of* England *discharg'd her Ministers, under Pain of Suspension, to give it to any that does not kneel?* I answer, That all Churches have establish'd their own Uniformity in this Matter, whether Kneeling, Standing or Sitting; and no knowing nor pious Person will picque a Quarrel with any Church, or disturb the Peace thereof upon the Account of a Circumstance. The Church must not prostitute its own Power; for, give a Popular Cheat an Inch of his Will, he'll seek an Ell. I ask you, would you give it to a Church of *England*-Man at *Dumbarton*, who would desire it Kneeling? I trow not. Why then should other Churches transgress its own Establishments more than yours?

When I say, that Christ did not say, *Do this until I come again*, that is, *Take it sitting till I come again*. Your Answer is, *Neither did he say, Take the Bread first and the Wine next.* As if forsooth the Sacrament could not be a Sacrament without sitting, more than it can be without Bread and Wine. Such Reasoning is unworthy of common Sense.

For that of receiving the Sacrament in a Table Gesture, according to the Fashion of every Country, is said without any Shadow of Proof, from Scripture, Reason, or Sense, and never was dream'd of by any ancient or modern Church in the World.

P. 53. Thou indicts me for *Tridentine Popery*, for that Expression, *The Word by which the Element is made a Sacrament*; but without Reason. For the Words of Institution, particularly, *This is my Body*, &c. must be in the Consecration, without which there can be no Sacrament.

P. 55. Thou libels for saying, *That tho' Leaning or Sitting had been the Posture at the first Institution; yet there is Reason now for a Posture of profound Reverence and Adoration; because they did not understand the Depth of the Mystery, until the coming of the Holy Ghost.* Your Answer is, that my Meaning is, *That their not Kneeling was a Sin of Ignorance; for they would have done it, if they had known better.* But I do not allow you to make Reasons for me; because you make but very bad ones for your self. But say you, *would not Christ told them, if they had been wrong?* To which I answer as formerly, that they kneel'd for ought you know, they lean'd for ought I know, and they stood for ought any knows; and not one of the Three Postures wrong.

You find Fault with my Saying, *That Christ was corporally present at that time, and they did not look upon Him as God incarnate, nor Worship Him with a Divine Adoration.* Against this you present me with a Confutation from these following Scriptures, 1. Chap. *Joh.* 49. 11. *Joh.* 27. 6. Ch. 69. 16. *Matth.* 16. 16. *Joh.* 29, 30. *Thou art the Son of God. Son of the living God. We are sure thou knowest all things.* I say, all these Scriptures do not infer, that they believed him to be God Essential, nor had they distinct Knowledge of the Persons of the *Trinity* or of the *Hypostatical Union*: *Angels*, *Adam*, & *Magistrates*, are called the Sons of God. And they might have believed, that Christ was the Son of God in a more special Manner than others who were so called, but not to be the eternal and incomprehensible God. They had but gross Conceptions of *Christ's Kingdom* even after the Resurrection.

Page

Digitized by Google

Page 55. You tell me, That I go on next in the ſame Argument, ſaying, *That Chriſt was then corporally preſent as a mortal Man, but now he is preſent in the Sacrament as God immortal.* You anſwer me by Way of Queſtion: *What! Was he not then preſent as God immortal as much as he's now? Deny that if you can; and if not, ſay, if ever thou heard ſuch a Blunder.* I ſhall let it be known, that thy Argument againſt me, is a very groſs Blunder, to ſpeak in thy own Stile and Byword. God immortal was preſent; but Chriſt, as *God-Man*, was not preſent as God immortal, as now he is: Becauſe *Chriſt dieth no more.* His Divinity could not die, no more did his Soul; yet the Son of God died, which may be inferred from the Scriptures you have cited againſt me to prove His Deitie.

P. 55, 56. When I ſay, *That the Presbyterian Argument againſt Kneeling is odious,* to wit, *that it ſymbolizes with Idolaters: And I inſtance, that Sitting has been as much abus'd, for it ſymbolizes with Heathens at their ſacrifical Feaſts, with the Pope and the* Benedictine *Monks, who take the Sacrament, Sitting; and with the* Socinians *that deny the Divinity of Chriſt.* Thou ſays, *In that they ſit, they are right; in that they do it on ſuch a Conſideration, they are wrong.* And ſo I do ſay of Kneeling; and then we are alike.

Page 56. You repeat what you ſaid in the Dialogue, *That the primitive Chriſtians never kneel'd on the* Lord's-Day, *no not at Prayers nor on any other Day of the Week betwixt* Eaſter *and* Whitſunday: What follows from this? That they did not kneel on any other Day throughout the Year, will not this ſay as much againſt Sitting? I told, They did not labour nor faſt on the *Lord's-Day*, it will not follow, but they did it on other Days? But I add to this, That I doubt, whether Standing was an univerſal Poſture upon theſe Days, and that becauſe St. *Auguſt.* does ſay ſo, *Epiſt.* 119. Cap. 7. his Words are, *That we pray ſtanding on thoſe Days, and every* Lord's-Day, *whether it be univerſally obſerved I do not know:* I truly read of Standing and Kneeling, but not one word of Sitting in Worſhip.

I told, P. 39. That Standing was a Poſture of Joy, which may be conſiſtent with Kneeling, which may alſo be a Poſture of Joy as well as of Humility, I cited 95. *Pſ. O come, let us make a joyful Noiſe, and kneel before the Lord,* &c. 17. *Gen.* 16. Abraham *fell on his Face and laughed,* &c. I told, *A Malefactor might receive his Pardon, and a Man of Merit his Honours upon his Knees.* But thou makes a Mockery of theſe Things, mutilating and disjoining Sentences, to put my Words in thy own Dreſs, and to make thy own Scoffing an Anſwer to them.

Page 57. You tell me, *That my Citation from St.* Chryſoſt. *proves, that we ſhould approach the Holy Table with Reverence,* ergo. What ſay you? *You know no Presbyterian, that ever deny'd it*; perhaps too, they practiſe it as much as their Neighbours.

Thou was ſo wiſe as not to repeat St. *Chryſoſt.* Sentence, which I cited, becauſe thou was ſure, that the Anſwer thou and all thy Gang could give, was not ſatisfying. And therefore I ſhall inſert it to your Hand and to all the Readers, to let it be ſeen, how wiſe thou art, to ſhun what thou art ſure will defeat thee. *Chryſoſt.* 24 Hom. Cap. 10. 1 Epiſt. to the *Corinth. This Body the wiſe Men reverenc'd, even when it lay in a Manger, and approaching thereto, worſhiped it, with Fear and great Trembling. Let us therefore who are Citizens of Heaven, imitate at leaſt theſe Barbarians. But thou ſeeſt this Body not in a Manger, but on the Altar, not held by a Woman, but by the Prieſt,* &c. *Let us therefore, ſtir up our ſelves, and be horribly afraid, and manifeſt a much greater Reverence than thoſe Barbarians, leſt coming lightly, and at a Venture, we heap Fire upon our Heads.*

I refer to any judicious Reader, if this Reverence be not an Adoration, *let us manifeſt a much greater Reverence, than the wiſe Men that worſhipped him in a Manger.* What may be thought of ſuch a Perſon, that conceals the Strength of his Antagoniſt's Arguments, to gain Credit to the Weakneſs of his own Defences? They dare not go to the Fathers, for the gray Beard of Antiquity is a Terrour to the new Goſpellers, *who are but of Teſterday and know nothing.*

And for Presbyterian Reverence to a Sacrament, is the Thing can never be ſeen; witneſs the Parade they make, draining up Nine or Ten Pariſhes, to meet in one Kirk and Kirk-yard, and there to eat and drink; tho' the Apoſtle ſays, *What have ye not Houſes to eat in, or deſpiſe ye the Houſe of God?*

This Citation from the Father might ſerve for an Argument of Kneeling: But I muſt ſay more, becauſe this Author makes a fair Bargain with me, in theſe Words following.

Digitized by Google

If you can find the Posture of Kneeling at the Communion before the Doctrine of the Corporal Presence was broach'd and obtain'd, I promise to come to the English *Service, and never to set Foot in a Presbyterian Kirk again.*

A very fair Offer; but I am sure, the Reason of an Angel will not convince thee from the Stipend of *Dumbartoun*. Thou'lt find Sophistry and Tergiversations to elude Demonstrations: But if there were any Hopes of re-establishing Episcopacy, I doubt not but very probable Arguments might tempt thee to a Change.

The Doctrine of the Corporal Presence began (as I find by Mr. *Evans* in his Treatise of *Kneeling*) in the East by *John Damascen*, in the Days of *Gregory* the III. and about an Hundred Years afterward, by *Paschasius Radbertus*, a Monk of *Corbie*, and one *Amalarius* of *Metz*, about the Year 740.

But that Kneeling was before that Time, I instance *Greg. Nazian.* in his Panegyric upon his Sister *Gorgonia*, in the Year 370, who being sick, and all Remedies proving ineffectual, she went to the Church, and having reserved some of the consecrated Elements, she went, and kneeling before the Altar, had eaten, and having prayed was made whole. *Du Pin* in the Life of *Greg.* tells, She mixt the Elements with her Tears: Her Brother calls her going to the Altar, A pious Piece of Confidence. Whatever Debate may be on the Head, as her being made whole, it may look Legendary-like, in this loose Age; but it is certain, the Reverend Father has her Kneeling before the Altar upon Record, with Approbation, in the Year 370. I instance from *Hamon l'Estrange*, in his *Alliance of Divine Offices*, Cap. 7. l. 8. c. 5. Of a Woman, which, to please her Husband, coming to the Communion, took the Bread, when the Priest gave it her, and kneeling down, as it had been to secret Prayer, convey'd it away; her Maid (standing by) privily stealing a Piece of common Bread into her Hands, which she did eat instead of the other. Whence it appeareth, that Kneeling then was not interdicted. And it is sure from the Fathers, that the Communion was taken in an adoring Posture; for St. *August.* says on the 98 Psal. *Let none presume to eat that Flesh, until first he pay an Adoration.*

That the primitive Christians took the Sacrament in a praying Posture, is clear to any that have read the Ancients: Standing was the Festival Posture, and Kneeling the Fasting Posture. This we learn from *Tertull.* who flourished in the Year 192. See him *de Coron. Milit. p.* 121. *Paris. Edit. An.* 1641. *cum Notis* Regaltii, *cap.* 3. speaking of that which is not determined by Scripture, yet is confirmed by Practice; which undoubtedly did proceed from Tradition. *How can any Thing* (says he) *be practised, unless it were handed down by Tradition?* And among the rest of Church Practices, here is one he mentions; *We reckon it an impious Thing, upon the Lord's Day, either to Fast or Kneel: We rejoice in the same Freedom from* Easter *to* Whitsunday.

So these, who did Communicate every Time they met, took the Sacrament, which is the most solemn Part of Worship, in the profoundest Adoration. See St. *Jerome, Proleg. in Comm. Epist. ad Ephes.* St. *Aug. Ep.* 119. *ad Jan. cap.* 15. We pray standing, in sign of the Resurrection.

Yet I said already, grounding my Saying upon St. *August. That it is a Doubt, whether Standing at Prayers on* Sunday *was an universal Practice:* For I find the 20 Canon of the Council of *Nice*, *Anno* 325, making an Act for Uniformity in Standing; because some pray'd Kneeling on the Lord's Day, *Because there are some that Kneel on the Lord's Day, and on the Days of* Pentecost (that is between *Easter* and *Whitsunday*) *it is therefore ordained by this Holy Synod, That when we pay our Vows unto the Lord in Prayer, we observe a Standing Posture, to the end that an uniform and an agreeable Custom may be maintained and secured by all Churches.* So that Kneeling was not discharged as unlawful, but as unfit for such Festival Seasons.

Now, Sir, what becomes of thy Many, Many a Four Hundred Years after the middle of the Third Century, that Kneeling was not heard of? If the Word *Kneeling*, that is mentioned in the *Nicene* Canon had been *Sitting*, it had been hugg'd by the *Didoclavian* Crew: I should truly think it an unanswerable Argument for Sitting, if the Word *Sitting* had been expresst in that Council. I could give more Citations to this Purpose; but I know to no purpose with those that are resolved to be stiff.

Digitized by Google

A Vindication of the Office of Burying the Dead according to the Liturgy.

THE Church of *England* giving Chriſtian Burial to all, that go under that Name, and who have not renounc'd the Faith, gives Provocation, but cannot give Offence (in the Scripture-Stile) to the Enemies of the Liturgy, who bury their Dead, with the *Burial of an Aſs*. They who *die in the Faith* are called *Believers*. All Chriſtians go under the Name of Elect; the Scripture gives theſe Titles to all who are baptiz'd, even in the Church of *Corinth*, which was charg'd with Error and groſs Scandals: See 1 *Cor.* 6. Ch. 11. ——*But ye are waſhed, but ye are ſanctified, but ye are juſtified in the Name of our Lord Jeſus, and by the Spirit of our God.* So in the Firſt General Epiſtle of St. *Peter*, 2. Ch. 9. all Chriſtians, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, are ſtiled by him, *a choſen Generation, a royal Prieſthood, an holy Nation, a peculiar People*, &c. The ſame Character was given to the *Jewiſh* Church, not only to the Good but to the Bad; becauſe they were in Covenant with God by *Circumciſion*, as we are by *Baptiſm*: So that it did not belong to particular Perſons, but to the whole *Jewiſh* Nation. Even to the Diſobedient, for 10. *Deut.* 15. 16. they are called the *Elect tho' ſtiff necked*. And that theſe Phraſes are applied to the Chriſtian Church without any Diſtinction, is clear from the forecited Places.

But to go to your own Notion of abſolute Election and Reprobation, you baptize all Children, not knowing whether they be predeſtinate to Salvation or Damnation, yet you cannot deny them Baptiſm. Again, as to the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*, you give it to the worthy and unworthy Receivers; ſaying, *Take, eat, This is my Body which is broken for you*: And yet you deny, that Chriſt died for all Men, even for many that hear the Word, and receive the Sacraments; becauſe you do not know, who are Elect or Reprobate? Now, what is this all the while that the Church of *England* does in this Office of Burying the Dead; but reads a ſerious Diſcourſe of Mortality and the general Reſurrection to the Survivers; and paſſes a Charitable Expreſſion or two upon the Defunct, without any Air of Infallibility or abſolute Certainty? *God makes His Sun to riſe upon the Juſt and Unjuſt*: And ſo ought our Charity reach to all Men; for a miſtaken Charity is better than none at all. God never told any Man in Scripture, who is in Hell; for the rich Glutton is not named, and it is a Parable. *Judas* his going into his Place is doubted, if it be Hell; and good Criticks make it to be *Matthias*, going into *Judas* his Place or taking his Apoſtleſhip: But admit it be to the Place of Torment, it is told by him, who knew all things; and it does not follow, that we may or ſhould pronounce Sentence of any Man's State, until *Chriſt divide the Sheep from the Goats*. We loſe nothing by Charity; and Certainty we have not of any Man's Caſe and State in the other World. May we not then as warrantably read that Charitable Diſcourſe and Prayer in the Office, as you adminiſter ſuch Sacraments as you can give, to your Elect and Reprobate? So God would ſave the wicked of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, for the Sake of Ten righteous Perſons; ſo may this Charitable Office be read for all Perſons, that have not renounc'd the Faith, and as we hope for Ten Thouſand righteous Perſons Sake: It is not we who ſhould make the Diſtinction of thoſe who are gone to the other World.

The Words you quarrel are, *Forasmuchas it hath pleas'd Almighty God, to take unto himſelf the Soul of our dear Brother, here departed, we therefore commit his Body to the Ground, in ſure and certain Hope of a Reſurrection to eternal Life. This Declaration* you ſay, *can do no Good to the Dead, but much Hurt to the Living*. I ſee no Proof you give for this bare Saying. Is any ſo ſimple as to think, that the charitable Office of burying the Dead can put his Soul in Heaven, without the Perſon be qualified for that Happineſs? Can this be known to us, who very often are miſtaken in our Opinions of Men, and have other Sentiments of Men than God has? The Multitude no doubt looked upon the Hypocritical Phariſee as a Child of God; and upon the *Scandalous* Publican, as a Reprobate and *a Caſtaway*: And yet his Heart was righter with God, than that Perſon whom the Multitude is apt to pronounce a true God fearing Man. In the 13 of St. *John* 27 verſ. When our Saviour ſaid to *Judas*, *what thou doſt, do quickly*, the Diſciples never thought, he was to betray his Maſter, but becauſe he carried the Bag, that he ſhould go and buy Proviſion for the Feaſt: They loſt nothing by their Charitie, tho' they were in a Miſtake. For *Charity believeth all Things*, 1 *Cor.* 13. that is, it believeth the beſt of all things until the contrary be evident; when Things are in a Doubt, it takes the Doubt in the more charitable Part.

A

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of a Vindication of the Office of Burying the Dead, &c.

AGAIN, when I did vindicate these Words, *In sure and certain Hopes to eternal Life*, I told, this did not relate to the Person deceast; but to the general Resurrection, which they, who bury the Dead, profess to believe for themselves, and in which Faith the Person interr'd did die. My Proof of this, you altogether keep out, for your own Sake: But this is your Ordinary, and a great Sign that it is not Truth that you are seeking for, but the standing of a Party, right or wrong.

That this was the Meaning, might appear from the next Words, where the Number is alter'd to the Plural, *Who shall change our vile Bodies*, &c. *not speaking of the Body of the Defunct*; which Words also you was pleased to slip over.

But you answer, That *in the Prayer to be said by the Priest, we have these Words*, "*We* "*give Thee hearty Thanks, for that it hath pleased Thee to deliver this our Brother out of the* "*Miseries of this sinful World*". Your Observation is in these Words: *I believe the delivering one out of the Miseries of this World, and to be thrown into the Torments of the next, is no Subject of Thanks; therefore the Hope relates to the Party deceast.* I answered that already, in the Words that you have omitted, and which I have above inserted. So that *Surety* and *Certainty* is not expreſt in that Prayer, but the Surety and Certainty is of our Belief of the General Resurrection, which is not in the Prayer, as any that reads the Book may see.

I told again, That the Words, *God's taking to Himself*, &c. are not absolute, or a Thing that we are certain of, but a charitable Hope that it is so. Besides I told, That *to go to God*, doth not mean, that the Person is in a State of Bliss; for *Eccles.* 12. 7. *The Spirit goeth to God who gave it*: This is said of all Men good and bad.

Your Reflection upon this is, *Are we not certain that all Men's Souls go to God to be judged? Is it not an absolute Truth; or have we only a charitable Hope thereof? If so; then from the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *good Lord deliver us.* These are most trifling Sophisms; and I wonder if the Author be taken with this Answer, or if he believes himself. We are sure, that all Souls go to God, to be disposed of at His own Pleasure: But we are not sure whom He saves, or whom He condemns; that is a Secret in His own Breast. And it is as sure, that the Person whom ye pronounce glorified, may be damn'd; and he whom you damn, may be saved. We know some of you, in Funeral Sermons, talk very confidently of such a Person's Salvation, *Would to God their Souls were where he is the Day*; others may be rash in determining, that these very Persons are in Hell. Our surest way is, to live in *Faith*, *Hope* and *Charity*, believing the Christian Principles, hoping well of all Men, wishing well to all the World, leaving God to judge righteous Judgment. Our Saviour gives a Check to these that judged rashly of the *Galileans*, *Luke* 13. 1, 2. I think all Christians are obliged to hope well of their dead Friends, and not to mourn, *as they who have not Hope*, to wit, of a Resurrection: This was given in Direction to the *Thessalonians*, Epist. 1. Ch 4. Verse 13. They knew not the State or Condition of their Friends in the other World, but the *Hope of the Resurrection* ought to comfort them. The Dead are called those that *sleep in the Lord*, we are no further concern'd in their Condition: Hoping well of the Deceast, and comforting one another with the Doctrine of the Resurrection, is not only a private but a publick Duty, 1 *Thess.* 4. 18. The Apostle does not enjoin them to trouble their Heads with anxious Doubts, but to hope well of them; and to draw Comfort from the Belief of the *Resurrection*: And our Charity can neither put them in Heaven, nor take them out of Hell. Nor is it any Encouragement to a lewd Liver, that he gets the charitable Complement of the Church at his Funerals; more than the Wicked Man's Piece of Ground is bedewed with the same Influence from Heaven, or warmed with the same Sun-shine that the Good Man's Labouring is. And this all the Doctors and learned Men do declare to be the Sense of the Church; tho' they cannot prevail with the Contentious, Schismatical, Hot-headed Spirits: We profess to live in the Land of Hope; and if in *this Life we had only Hope, we were of all Men the most miserable.*

Why

Digitized by Google

Why then may not a charitable Oration paſs at the Funerals of a Perſon that has not renounced the Faith, as well as the Adminiſtration of Sacraments, the Seals of the Covenant of Grace, paſs upon theſe who are within the viſible Church, whether they be elected or reprobated, in the abſolute Senſe which *Scots* Presbyterians do maintain? And truly in my Opinion, if Perſons ſhould be deprived of this charitable Funeral Office of the Church, it is theſe who are Rebels and Schiſmaticks, whoſe Condition is more to be feared than the Publicans and Sinners, who have not renounced the Church Communion. If *Jezabel* (2 *Kings* Chap. 19.) ſhould get a Royal Burial, becauſe ſhe was a King's Daughter; ought not a Chriſtian get a charitable Burial, becauſe he lived and died in the Communion of the Church?

But according to Presbyterian Metaphyſical Principles, be a Man never ſo groſs and ſcandalous in his Life; yet if he have (as they phraſe it) *the Root of the Matter in him*, if he be of the *Election of Grace*, no Sin can ſeparate him from God, according to *Samuel Rutherford*'s Doctrine in his *Epiſtles*, *Hell-falls of Sins cannot ſeparate us from Chriſt*. What Hazard then is there in reading the Form of the Burial of the Dead, even for ſcandalous Perſons, who (for ought we know) are of the *Election of Grace*?

The Word, *Dear Brother*, in the Office, diſpleaſes ſome very groundleſly; for that may be ſaid of any Chriſtian, be he good or ill: So, *If thy Brother has offended thee*, &c. *If any that is called a Brother be a Fornicator*, &c. *If a Brother walk diſorderly*, &c.

The Word *Eternal Life*, you tell us, *is never taken in Scripture, but in a favourable Senſe*. I anſwer, when it is limited to the Righteous only. But as every Contrary implies its own contrary Propoſition; ſo this is underſtood to imply the Eternal Death of the Wicked, which may be called an Eternal Life, for its Duration and ſenſe of Eternal Miſery, as well as the other is of Happineſs. And this I told, might be underſtood of the *Apoſtolick* and *Niſene* Creeds, *I believe Life everlaſting, and the Life of the World to come*.

In the End, when I cite the Reaſonings of learned Liturgiſts, whom thou mocks, as if they were not worthy to looſe thy Shoes, thou mangles a Citation which I cite out of the learned *Bennett*, omitting and leaving out his Explanation and Reaſoning, as I inſerted, and puts in ſuch Words as thou thought thou could'ſt anſwer beſt.

I ſaid, P. 42. upon theſe Words, " In ſure and certain Hope, *&c.*" *We are only ſaid to hope that, which we wiſh and deſire; tho' we have no particular Ground to believe, we are not ſure of the contrary, or that the thing is impoſſible. For Inſtance, ſuppoſe in a Storm, we ſhould ſpeak of a Friend at Sea, one Man, conſidering the Greatneſs of the Tempeſt, ſays, I fear he is loſt; another replies, I hope not: No Aſſurance can be had on either ſide; one hopes, another fears, and both conſiſtent here. So that there is a two-fold Hope, firſt an Hope of Aſſurance, which riſes or falls according to the Appearance of Evidence; next there is an Hope of Deſire, which is built upon a charitable Affection, and ſuch is this in the Office of burying the Dead.* Theſe Words are plain and clear, but the Uſe you make of them is, *That by them you'll maintain Prayer for the Dead by the Church of* England; *for* (ſay you, P. 60.) " Prayer is an offering up of our Deſires." *What Difference then is there between praying for the Dead, and hoping with Deſire for them?* Now, was ever ſuch a Childiſh trifling Quibble heard, as to infer from the learn'd Doctor *Bennet*'s Words, that the Church of *England* prays for the Dead: Whereas, neither the Practice of the Church will prove it, nor can the Doctor's Words bear it? For Prayer is an offering up of our Deſires according to the Word and Will of God, and from an unqueſtionable Principle of Duty: But does the Church of *England* deſire that the deceaſt Perſon may be in Heaven, tho' he deſerves Hell? Or does it not rather declare its Ignorance of the State of the Defunct; but in Charity hopes the beſt: As the *Apoſtle* in a fore-cited Place, deſires Chriſtians, not to ſorrow for their deceaſt Relations, as *the Heathens who had no Hope of a Reſurrection?*

When I ſay, that *John Knox*'s Form of Abſolution is more abſolute, than the Form in the Viſitation for the Sick in the Service Book. You ſay *not ſo, for* J. Knox's *Form has this Clauſe*, [According to thy Repentance.] And what, does the Church of *England*, abſolve whether the Penitent will or not? Do not all the Doctors declare, that the Condition is implied? And are not *J. K*'s Words more explicite, ſaying, that *I pronounce thy Sin to be looſed in Heaven*: Not that I condemn the Words, becauſe I know that is conditional; but it is more full than the Form of the Viſitation, which is as conditional as *J. K*'s Form.

There

Digitized by Google

There is one thing in this Section that you reſent very highly, and with no other Anſwer, than this, that it is *an impudent Lie*. Whereas, if you had fully repeated my Words, the Reader would find it to be a very ſad Truth. My Words were, *That of all Men living* Presbyterians *ſhould leaſt caſt up canonizing Men for Saints, or ſending them to Heaven.* You omitted the next Words, which proved my Aſſertion, viz. *Witneſs their Martyrologies of Rebels, Aſſaſſines and Murderers, in the* Naphtali *and other Pamphlets, and the Tomb they have erected in the* Gray-friars *Church-yard.* Why did you conceal theſe Words from your Reader, but becauſe you and they both knew that they were unanſwerable?

Of the Uncharitableneſs charg'd by this Author upon the Church of England, *to Infants dying unbaptiz'd.*

YOU avowedly affirm, That, *the longer you live, you are ſtill the more perſwaded of it, that the Church of* England *damns all ſuch as die unbaptiz'd:* Sir, I ſay no more, but that if Men be damn'd, for *bearing falſe Witneſs againſt one ſingle Neighbour*, much more will they be damn'd, for bearing falſe Witneſs againſt a whole Church, and alledge upon it, that which all the Paſtors and Members of it, peremptorly deny. If it be the Fault of Parents or Paſtors that Children are not baptized; they deſerve Puniſhment, but not the poor Infants, that could not help themſelves; more than the *Jewiſh* Infants, who could not prolong their Time till the Eighth Day, on which they ought to be circumcis'd, and be in Covenant with God.

Your Reaſon is, *For if God allow them Heaven, why ſhould the Church deny them Chriſtian Burial?* The Anſwer is very eaſy, Becauſe they have not been admitted Members into the Church of Chriſt; for, if being born of Chriſtian Parents, be enough to entitle them to Church Privileges, then Baptiſm is unneceſſary; becauſe they have a Right, whether they be admitted or not: And conſequently, when they grow up, and are ſufficiently inſtructed in the Principles of Chriſtianity, whether they were baptiz'd or not, they may partake of the Lord's Supper: So that my Queſtion to Presbyterian Preachers, is not black Nonſenſe as you call it, P. 62. it is this, Whether or not they would give the Communion to any Perſon that is not baptiz'd; tho' he own'd and ſubſcrib'd the *Weſtminſter* Confeſſion of Faith, but thought Baptiſm unneceſſary? You tell no Man can own that Confeſſion of Faith, and think Baptiſm unneceſſary.

But, Sir, is it the firſt Time that Presbyterians own'd the *Confeſſion* and the *Directory*, and the *Acts of the General Aſſembly*, and yet did cut and carve upon ſome Parts of them as they pleaſed? You know what Uſe you make of the 23d Chap. *Infidelity or Difference in Religion*, &c. There is nothing more expreſly recommended in the *Directory*, than to read Scripture, and to ſay the Lord's Prayer; and yet Presbyterians can ſubſcribe that *Directory*, and think it unneceſſary either to read Scriptures, or to ſay the Lord's Prayer, as their general Practice declares. The *Acts of the General Aſſembly* appoint, That no private Baptiſms ſhall be adminiſtred to dying Infants, in private Houſes; and yet you can counteract this in your Practices, and perform this Office your ſelves, rather than a Curate ſhould do it. So a Man may have a very mean Opinion of Baptiſm, and yet own the Confeſſion of Faith; witneſs your ſuffering Children to die at the Pulpit-foot, in your Congregations, becauſe you had not done with your Lecturings. Was there any greater Sign imaginable of the low Eſteem of that Initiatory Sacrament, than this? Yea, ſome of you have defended this publickly, ſaying, You think much of Baptiſm, Sirs; but I knew a good Godly Miniſter, who lived Fourſcore Years, and was never baptized in his Days.

Now what is it in this Matter that the Church of *England* does, but what the primitive Chriſtians did to their *Catechumens*; tho' they were competently inſtructed in the Chriſtian Principles, yet if they died unbaptized, the Funeral Offices were not performed to them, as they were to baptized Chriſtians? I find, that as every Church has its own particular Cuſtom; ſo it is a Cuſtom among the *Cantons* of *Swizerland*, That all the Names of deceaſt Perſons, are rehears'd every *Sunday* in their Paroch Kirks. But excommunicate Perſons, Malefactors, ſelf Murtherers, are not mentioned; no more are unbaptiz'd Infants. Not that they claſs them together, but becauſe an excommunicate Perſon is turn'd out of the Church, by his own Fault; and the unbaptiz'd Infant was never admitted into the Church

In Concil. Bracoenſi. 1mo. Chryſoſt. Hom. 69. ad pop. Antioch.

Digitized by Google

Church, yet is not depriv'd of Happineſs, becauſe it was not the Infant's own Fault. And pray, what more does the Church of *England*, which does not damn the Heathens, altho' they be not in Covenant with God, yet living up to their Light, may have a Share of God's uncovenanted Mercy? And when you ſay, Chriſtian Parents have God's Promiſe to themſelves and their Children, is not this by vertue of a Covenant, whereof Baptiſm is the Sign and the Seal? And can theſe be ſaid to be in Covenant with God, who are not ingrafted into Chriſt by Baptiſm?

Again to prove, that the Church of *England* damns them, you ask this Queſtion, *Why does the Church of* England *allow Laicks and Midwives to baptize, if ſhe did not believe, they would be damn'd dying without Baptiſm*? I confeſs, I am ignorant if the Church does ſo; and if the Laicks do ſo, I think it more valid than Presbyterian Baptiſm, becauſe they pretend Authority againſt the Church, and have no lawful Ordination; but the Laicks pretend Neceſſity and a Church Permiſſion: But I find the moſt learn'd Ritualiſt, *Dr. Comber*, upon *The Form of Baptiſm*, not allow of Lay Baptiſm at all.

Of the Ring in Marriage.

AS for the Uſe of the Ring, which was a rational, ſignificant and univerſal Ceremony, among the Jews and Gentiles, and among the firſt Chriſtians in the Days of Miracles and Martyrdom, it cannot be but an Humour of Quarrelling and Averſion to Unity, that occaſions ſuch an Objection againſt the Church. And in the Spirit of Charity I ſay, that it is not Conſcience, but Conceit and Contention; not Scruple, but Schiſm and Deſign to ſubvert the Church, that raiſes ſuch Strife and Debate againſt what is innocent, ancient and decent: For to ſuch Spirits a Mote is a Mountain, and a Gnat a Camel; and Nothing is made ſome Great Thing.

But I ſee the Diſſenters in *England* will eaſily win over their Scruple of marrying with the Ring, before they want a Wife and Dowry. To this Mr. *Anderſon* anſwers, *That Force will make a Man ſtick his own Mare*: Which in plain *Scots* is, That a Man muſt lay aſide Conſcience, and act againſt it, before he loſe his Profit or Pleaſure in this World. I think, a Man ought rather to ſtick his Mare than his Conſcience: But Diſſenters will not only comply with Marriage by the Ring, but even with the Book of Common Prayer, which they count Popiſh; and by an Occaſional Communion, come to a Sacrament which they count Idolatrous. Now, if Men that have Occaſional Principles, and turn like the Weather-cocks, might not as well comply with Papiſts, Jews and Turks, with Occaſional Conſciences, as they do with the Church of *England* againſt which they exclaim, let Men of ſound Principle, Senſe and Reaſon determine. If this be not like a Man, that cries out againſt Idolatry, and goes to the Worſhip of Idols for his Bread, I give over my Skill of natural and artificial Logick.

The Ring was uſed for a Sign of Friendſhip and of Truſt, *Gen.*41.42. *Gen.* 38. *Eſth.* 3. 10, 12. *Maccab.* 6. 15. *Luke* 15. 22. So alſo among the Heathens, 6th Satyr of *Juvenal*, Marriage is deſcrib'd,

If then thy lawful Spouſe thou can'ſt not love,
What Reaſon ſhould thy Mind to Marriage move?
Why all the Charges of the Nuptial Feaſt,
Wine and Deſerts, and Sweet-meats to digeſt?
The endowing Gold that buys the dear Delight,
Giv'n for your firſt and only happy Night? Dryden.

I need not inſiſt upon the Allegories or Alluſions, or the poſitive Inſtitution of the Church, as it makes the Ring an Earneſt and Pledge of Conjugal Love and Truſt, during the Life of the married Parties: This is well enough underſtood.

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of vindicating the Ring in Marriage

YOU tell us, that *the learned* Bacon *was offended at it.* I do not find much of that by the Words which you repeat. For all you say from him is, that *it seemeth to many of no vulgar Sense and Understanding, to be a Ceremony not grave, especially to be made, as the Words make it, the Essential Part of the Action.* He only declares the Sentiments of some other Men, who tho' they wished it mended, yet would make a Breach in the Church upon that Account.

I think the Authority of the Ancients in the Days of the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, should cast the Ballance against any modern Authority you can produce, for I cited *Tertullian* his *Apol.* Cap. 6. telling that, among the ancient and laudable Customs of the *Roman* Empire, one is, that *Women wore Gold on that Finger where the Bridegroom had put the Pledge of the Matrimonial Ring.* And, *de Idolo* Cap. he tells, it was no Part of the Pagan Idolatry. I cited also *Clem. Alex.* Lib. 3. C. 2. who says, That the Ring was not given for an Ornament only, but as a Seal of Trust of what the Husband commits to the Wife's Custody.

To all this you say, *it was used as a* Roman *Custom, but not as a religious Rite.* To which I answer, that, the Christians adopted that Rite in their Christian Marriages, and made it as much *Christian*, as it was *Roman.*

You own, that *it is lawful for a Civil Government to make the Ring a Symbol, in a Bargain of Marriage; as Earth, Stone, Hesp and Staple, the Symbols, in an Infestment of House or Lands: But to make it or any Thing else a religious significant Ceremony, is not* (you affirm) *in the Power of any Creature.* You assert stoutly, but you prove nothing. And I affirm, that it is absurd to say, that a Civil Government has Power to make Civil significant Ceremonies, and that the Church has not Power to make Ecclesiastical significant Ceremonies; for this were to give less Power to the Christian Church, than the *Jews* had in making uncommanded Ceremonies, in their ordering of fixt Fasts and Festivals, and all the outwards in their Sacraments, Marriages and Burials, which any may read at large in any that writes upon the *Jewish* Customs. Besides, Dr. *Saywell*, Mr. *Stileman*, Mr. *Robertson*, *&c.* have found your Assertion proven to be contrary to the Sentiments and Practices of the learnedest Dissenters in *England*, I affirm also, that symbolizing with *Jews*, Heathens or Papists in Things that are rational, pertinent, decent, regular, if the Signification of them have not a *Jewish*, Heathenish or Popish Intention, is no Sin. I affirm also, and am ready to shew in a Number by it self, that the Church has Power to institute and impose it's own Ceremonies, which are not contrary to Sense, Reason, or Revelation.

You instance Bishop *Pilkington*, that he *complains, that in Marriage, and many other Things, we are too like unto the Papists.* And I instance unto you the Authority of Mr. *Baxter*, who speaks better Sense, and proves his Opinion, particularly of the Ring, to better Purpose than the bare Assertion of any Bishop, for as well as I love the Order. See the Collection of the Dissenters Opinions, in favour of the Church of *England* Ceremonies.

Of the Rule of finding out Easter

IN the last place, you continue (as in your Dialogue) mocking and ridiculing the Rule of finding out *Easter*, as if you were the only Person that had made that Discovery of the Perplexities and Difficulties, in that Calculation, at least, you make Presbyterian Readers believe so much. Whereas the Church of *England*'s Writers themselves, did publish all that you have said or can say, and before you was born, but with a different Intention: You do it to expose the Church to Derision, and with a Design to make your implicite Disciples hate keeping of the Memory of Christ's Resurrection, in Order and Uniformity.

What, doth not the Church of *England* know the Differences that fell out betwixt the Eastern and Western Churches, anent the Keeping of *Easter*? Do they not understand

Digitized by Google

the

the Hiſtory of the Inſtitution of *Eaſter* in the Council of *Nice*? Do they not know of the Conſultation given by *Egyptian* Aſtronomers, anent the Day that was appointed to be the *Vernal Æquinox*? Do they not know the Table that was made by *Dionyſius Exiguus*? I believe it is by them, that you came to the Knowledge of Debates about *Eaſter*, for few Whiggs ſtudy any thing of *Kalendar* Learning, becauſe they have no Uſe for it.

When I told you, that be the Calculation of *Eaſter* an Error or not, it is but circumſtantial and not ſubſtantial. To this you anſwer, That *be it an Error or not, every Curate in* England, *is obliged to declare his Aſſent and Conſent thereto, and that from the Pulpit, which ſhould be the Chair of Verity.*

To which I anſwer *firſt*, that if your Presbyterian Pulpits were not more guilty of worſe Lyings, and that maliciouſly, wittingly and willingly; there would be more Peace and Holineſs, and Knowledge of the Chriſtian Religion in the Land, than ever was or is like to be, ſo long as Presbytery tyrannizes and keeps the People from the plain Truth of the Creed.

But *Secondly*, If you, who pretends to read Ritualiſts, were not reſolved to be contentious and to ſerve a Turn by a popular Trick, you might be eaſily ſatisfied by Dr. *Balcanqual*, who tells, *That nothing more is meant by Declaration of Aſſent and Conſent, than ſubſcribing to the Lawfulneſs of the Book of Common-Prayer.* And he ſhews that all Churches in the World require Subſcriptions to their Conſtitutions for Peace and Order's Sake.

This Liberty your Kirk takes to it ſelf, but you'll deny it to the Church of Chriſt. I find one of your preſent Kirk-men, in a Letter againſt Mr. *M'millan* and the reſt of the Hill-men, lay down this Poſition, *That the Sentence of the Church Judicatories muſt be ſubmitted to, tho' unjuſt, and Redreſs to be crav'd and expected, from Superior Judicatories.* And this, he ſays, was alwiſe the Sentiments of Orthodox Divines. Why then muſt not a Point in Debate, or circumſtantial Controverſies, be referred to Church Judicatories, who are very far from being unjuſt in the Matter, that they determine, according to their Knowledge, and the Commands of their Superiours.

As to my Saying, That *tho' it were an Error, yet we do not loſe the Devotions nor Inſtructions of the Myſteries of Faith*, viz. the *Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, and Deſcent of the Holy-Ghoſt.*

Your Anſwer is, *to what Purpoſe is this; Do Whiggs loſe theſe Devotions?* To which I anſwer, they cannot loſe them, becauſe they never had them. *For* (ſay you) *tho' they neither keep Feſtivals, nor have a Rubrick true or falſe for that End; yet they both preach on theſe Subjects, and pray and praiſe ſuitably to them, at leaſt, as frequently as you do.*

Sir, were I diſpos'd to give Names or hard Words to theſe Aſſertions, according to your Stile of Scolding; I could be free to ſay, that there is hardly a Corner in the Nation, that ever heard few or any of you inſiſt upon the Incarnation, Nativity, Sufferings, Reſurrection or Aſcenſion, unleſs you mention them as incidental Propoſitions, or by the By. Theſe are the Subjects you inſiſt upon, bare Opinions, dark myſterious Places, Predeſtination and Aſſurance, and Things debateable, and ſometimes unſound, which you turn into Prayers, which none ſhould hear. And always the Subjects are at your own Diſcretion, you never preach in an *Unity*, unleſs it be occaſionally by Order of the General Aſſembly, in order to overturn the Church of *England*, and to pray God to pull down the *Biſhops*, and the *Book of Common-Prayer.*

However, the Rule is right, even according to that Table, which I reprinted againſt you, and is cleard at large by the Author of it, which I cited, and which you may have for the buying, at *Edinburgh.*

You tell us Twice or Thrice, *that the Word* ON *or* UPON *would make the Rule right according to the* Engliſh *Scheme, implying if not importing, that the Words,* NEXT AFTER, *make it all wrong.* But, Sir, does not the Church of *England* know this as well as you? Do they not know the Two Extremes of the firſt Full Moon and *Eaſter*-Day are *incluſive*, that is reckoning the full Moon for one Day, and *Eaſter*-Day for another. As for Example, when we ſay, that Aſcenſion is Fourty Days after the Reſurrection; the Reſurrection is reckoned the Firſt, and Aſcenſion is the laſt.

If you criticiſe too far, upon the Word, *After*, you will be heavy upon the Scriptures, 27 *Matth.* 63. *We remember this Deceiver ſaid while he was yet alive, after Three Days I*

riſe

Digitized by Google

rise again. Now if you be nice upon the Word, his Resurrection would be on the Fourth Day. There are ten times more Chronological Difficulties in Scripture; yet no good Man will reject the Word of God upon that Account.

I shall end with a short Story of the Island of *Rona*, which is sixty Miles of Sea from any Island or Mainland in the World; Five Families make up all the Inhabitants. They had by some of them being dispersed on Sea, and others being employed at Home in catching of Wild Fowl, forgot the Day of the Week, and consequently the *Lord's Day*, which formerly they kept religiously; yet when they met together, they kept a Day for it, till they were informed by the next Boat that came from the *Lewis*, what the true Day was. So we perform the Duties of *Easter*, be the Calculation right or wrong, and the Church by the Words, *Next after*, understands, *Upon*; and so according to your self the Rule is right. And so I wish you and your Party were as right and true Members of the Christian Church.

Farewel.

Observations *upon Mr.* Anderson's *Excursions and Digressions, or what he says by the By, besides arguing against the* Book of Common Prayer.

HERE I pass by Mr. *Anderson*'s Railings, Banterings and Pedantry, which make up a great Part of his Book, as being unworthy of any Answer.

Page 3. he asserts, *That many poor Families did bear the Mark of Persecution by the Curates; who, whether they were dumb Dogs that could not* Bark, *I shall not say; but I shall assure you, they never deny'd but they could* Bite: *And whatever Doubt they have made of their having a* Tongue; *yet they never made any of their having* Teeth. *I do not mean these, that suffered for that which was then called* Rebellion; *such were mercifully hang'd out of the way by Pairs and half Dozens, tho' their Principles were none other, than what have been both avowed and practised by the Body of the Church of* England *Clergy since that Time; yea even to the Doctrine of the Intrinsick Power of the Church, which then was ridicul'd as an Enthusiastical* Whiggish *Notion, but is now hugg'd as the Darling of the most Rank-wing'd* High-Flyers; *but I mean such, as were hounded and harassed simply for Non-Conformity, and not coming to Church.*

Here is a Complex of most malicious Lies: And if this Asserter, or any that knows the Matter of Fact, in King *Charles* the Second's Government, believe what this Author says, it is because God has given them over to strong Delusions, to believe a Lie. Therefore Ministers, who liv'd in the West, are obliged, in Credit and Conscience, to publish the Falshood of this Man's confident Assertions. It is well known, that several Curates were instrumental in saving several deluded Creatures from the Stroke of Justice; who yet, in this Revolution, were, by their Guides, made Instruments to rabble and bear false Witness against their Benefactors: Witness the Ministers of *Stirling*, of *Dalkeith* and *Cranston*, &c. Of which publick Accounts have been already, and shall be further given.

Did not these Men suffer for Principles and Practices, which no Government in the World could tolerate: Men kept in gross Ignorance; that heard nothing in Preachings and Prayers, but the *Cursing of Kings* and *Bishops*, and the *Overturning* of their *Government*; the Breach of the *Solemn League and Covenant*; *Fighting the Battles of the Lord*: Men, who were bred up in the Principles and Practice of *Jus Populi*, *Naphtali*, *Lex Rex*, and the *Hind let loose*: By which the Gospel was altogether poyson'd, and the Notion of Peace and Holiness rooted out of the Hearts and Heads of Men, by the wild, bloody and giddy Doctrine, which was preach'd by the *Hill-Men*, commonly called *Cameronians*. Did not Mr. *Daniel Cargill* excommunicate the *King* and the *Royal Family*? And were not many poor People execute, who would not redeem their Lives by saying, *God save the King*? And was not this the Fruit of the rebellious Doctrine which was preach'd up to them? And it was by vertue of that Excommunication,

Digitized by Google

cation, that they refuſed to pray for the King. And were not theſe the *Cameronians* that ſuffered, and whom the *Presbyterians*, in their Thankſgiving to King *James* the VII. for His Toleration, diſown'd as any of their Communion; and yet moſt knaviſhly own their Sufferings to be Presbyterian, but deny their Actings to be ſuch. This is ſo well made out by Sir *George Mackenzie*'s *Vindication of the Government of King* Charles *the Second*, that there is no Poſſibility for a true and rational Reply.

Can Satan himſelf be guilty of a more impudent Lie, than to ſay, That the Church of *England* ridicul'd the Intrinſick Power of the Church, as an Enthuſiaſtick and *Whiggiſh* Notion? Whereas neither Whiggs nor Enthuſiaſts have any Church at all, becauſe they want Paſtors, deriving their Succeſſion from the Apoſtles.

Who can read the Twentieth Article of the Church of *England*, and Ten Eccleſiaſtical Canons, from the Third to the Twelfth *incluſivè*, and ſay, that the Church of *England* ridicules the Intrinſick Power of the Church? Does it not maintain it's own Power in making Ceremonies, and judging in Matters of Faith? Does it not maintain it ſelf to be a True Apoſtolical Church, and cenſure and excommunicate all that oppoſe it's *Worſhip*, *Doctrine*, *Diſcipline*, *Government* and *Ceremonies?* Are not the Clergy ſworn by their Aſſent and Conſent, to maintain the Intrinſick Power of the Church? What then may not this Man ſay, when he vents ſuch a Lie to the World? Reader, then remember, That no Man ſuffer'd in the Government of King *Charles* the II. ſimply for being a Presbyterian, but for being a Rebel; which any Man deſerved though he were Epiſcopal. Remember alſo, that they were but *Cameronians* and *Sweet-Singers* that both acted and ſuffered; and if theſe were Presbyterians, they deſerved what they met with: If there were others who thought that the *Cameronians* ſpoke, acted and owned the Principles of the bloody Covenant, by which they gave Ground of Jealouſy to the Higher Powers, though they had not the Courage to act like the furious Zealots and Mad-Caps, yet drew the Vengeance of the Law upon themſelves for Nonconformity; I cannot ſee how the Government could be blamed in this Matter: For this ſame Revolution pleaded a State-Neceſſity for acting againſt their own *Grievances* and *Claim of Right*, impriſoning ſome, and torturing others, upon meer Suſpicion.

Now to make a Parallel; Be it known, that this Kingdom, before the Uſurpation of *Oliver*, was free of Ceſs, Exciſe, *&c.* But at the King's Reſtoration, theſe were kept up as formerly. And ſo the Acts that were made in the Time of Presbytery, againſt thoſe that did not keep their Paroch Kirks, were not altered in the Time of the Reſtoration of Epiſcopacy. So that if there be any Evil in the Matter, the *Oliverian* and *Presbyterian* Governments were the Beginners of this Tyranny: But both Parties ſaw, that there was a State-Neceſſity for ſuch Laws and Executions. Therefore That can be no Argument from any Party againſt another, that can be retorted with Diſadvantage upon the Complainers.

Page 4. Mr. *A.* blames me for uſing Retortions; and yet he takes, throughout his whole Book, the Liberty of Retorting againſt me: Which minds me of a Story of a *Quaker*, who defending his Principle of Immediate Revelation, againſt ſome Diſputants, treated his Antagoniſts with ſuch Names as theſe, *Dogs*, *Cats*, *Serpents*, *Crocodiles*: One preſent ſaid, O Friend! is that the Spirit that rails in thee? *Nay*, ſays the *Quaker*, *but that which is Railing in thee, is not Railing in me.*

Ibid. Mr. *A.* has theſe Words, *I here challenge you to give Inſtance of ſo much as any one Perſon of the Epiſcopal* Perſwaſion *in* Scotland, *that, ever ſince the Revolution, ſuffered the Loſs of one Sixpence, or one Hour's Impriſonment, for not coming to Church.*

You did that which was much worſe; for you bereav'd the People of their lawful Paſtors, whom you haraſs'd, impriſon'd and baniſh'd; yea, even thoſe that were qualify'd, and gave all the Demonſtrations of their Affections to the Government. How were the Clergy perſecuted from their Places; falſe Witneſſes ſuborn'd againſt them, to prove blind Libels, without giving Information of their Accuſers? 'Tis true, you had no Sacramental Teſts, becauſe you had few or no Sacraments; but they that did not conform to your Kirk, were not gracious to the Government; yea were haraſs'd and perſecuted: Witneſs the City of *Aberdeen*, in Provoſt *Johnſton*'s Caſe; and the Town of *Elgin* for their Adherence to Epiſcopacy; *Kirkwal* in *Orkney*, and ſeveral other Places: Of which an hiſtorical Account ſhall be given, to confute your falſe and impudent Aſſertions.

A

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of Obſervations on Mr. Anderſon's *Excurſions*, &c.

WHAT greater Injury cou'd be done, than to deprive the People of their Paſtours, who had not the Freedom to hear the Schiſmaticks, who were daily praying the Biſhops and the Book of Common-Prayer out of the World? The moſt deviliſh Politick that *Julian the Apoſtate* could uſe againſt the Chriſtians (when he took not their Lives) was, to deprive them of their Schools and Seminaries of Learning, for to encourage the *Pagan* Idolatry.

The Account of the Perſecution of the Clergy is well known through the Kingdom, and has, and ſhall be publiſh'd to Poſterity, to the eternal Reproach of your Kirk, which keeps the People in groſs Ignorance of the Chriſtian Religion; which if you had plainly preach'd to them, there wou'd not be ſo much Miſchief and ill Nature, as now there is.

Page 7. Your Words are, *I affirm, that the Communion has been oftner given theſe* 12 *Years laſt bypaſt, in moſt Paroches in* Scotland, *than during the whole* 28 *Years, preceeding the Revolution, wherein you governed. I challenge you to put it to a Trial: I am ſure your Reputation requires it.*

I ask you, Whether was it God or the Devil that told you this? It was not God, becauſe, He's a God of Truth; and for the Devil he is the Father of Lies, and we are not oblig'd to believe him: Say then in Conſcience, did you put it to a Trial, and found it to be ſo as you ſay. I am ſure you did it not. And when I put it to a Trial, you will be found to have ſpoke it at random. This is but too ſoft a Word to expreſs your Crime in this Matter, in impoſing upon the common Senſe of the Nation to ſerve a Turn to your Party. You tell us of the laſt twelve Years bypaſt; what came of the twelve Years before, for you have been in Place near 24 Years? I knew them, who have been Thirty Years Incumbents, that never offer'd to give the Communion, and Teachers paſt Fourſcore that never gave it; and it was much doubted, if ever they took it. Now judge, if it be likely, that ever you examin'd through the Nation, how oft it was given, during the 28 Years of Epiſcopacy? If you ſay, you did: I'll not believe you, tho' you ſhould ſwear it, unleſs you produce convincing Evidences for it. Did moſt in the Paroches of *Scotland* give the Sacrament for 28 Years but eleven Times? For I am ſure, theſe 12 Years bypaſt, you gave it not above 12 Times. Yea in moſt of the Paroches of *Scotland*, you have not given it ſix Times ſince the Revolution, very many not once; and if I make out this, I demonſtrate you to be a moſt confident Impoſer upon the Credulity of your Followers, and upon the common Senſe of the Church of *Scotland*.

Pag. 5. You ſay That *we are vaſtly more guilty than ye in this Matter; ſo the Church of* England *is not innocent, for this you inſtance Biſhop* Wettenhall.

Sir you forgot your ſelf in the preceeding Page, that *retorquere non eſt reſpondere*, that is, *two Blacks make not a White*. Did you examine, how oft we have given it? Some of our Meeting-Houſes, that uſe the Service, give it twelve Times a Year, beſides other feſtival Days. And for the Church of *England*, it does the ſame: If there be ſome particular Places more negligent than others, that is not general, nor is it the Fault of the *Engliſh* Church Conſtitution. And Biſhop *Wettenhall* complains generally, that it is not oftner given than twelve Times a Year, or that it is not given every Sunday; and of one particular Paroch, *Tunbridge* be Name; but not of the whole Church, as you would make your ſimple Reader believe.

Page 7. You affirm that I ſay, *That Presbyterians read no Scriptures at all.* But you forget to add the following Words, *unleſs an immediate Expoſition follow, which was the Fault that Mr.* Baillie *a Presbyterian Profeſſor of Divinity at* Glaſgow, *challeng'd in the Independants.* You ſtill leave out what you cannot anſwer.

Ibid. You affirm moſt impudently, that *we expoſe Lecturing as a Presbyterian Invention*: We know better Things, and that it was the primitive Practice, and I hope ever to follow it. If the Author of the *Fundamental Charter* break a Jeſt on it, it is not becauſe he thought it a Presbyterian Invention, but becauſe you abuſe and burleſqu

leſque the Scriptures, inſiſting upon Things unneceſſary, or chuſing a Portion of Scripture at your own Diſcretion, lecturing on Lives of ill Kings, to beget an Hatred to the Royal Family, and neglecting to inſiſt on the Life of the *Holy Jeſus*, never letting the People know the Goſpel Spirit. Page 8, 9. You ſay, Has *Hatton* anſwered the *particular Reaſonings* on each Head in the Dialogue? I ſhall produce a Score of Reaſons in the Dialogue, which neither he nor indeed you have ſo much as hinted at. I declare ingenuouſly, that I did not find an half Score of Reaſons in both your Dialogues; and there is no Man of Senſe and Integrity, that has compared your Book and mine together, will ſay, that your Book is an Anſwer to mine. I know the Phanatick Ignorants, who neither can or ever did read any of them, will pronounce in your Favours againſt all the Biſhops and Doctors of *England*, and think you a Giant, and them but poor Punies and Pygmies; and really your Compliments upon your own Performances, would infer, that you are of the ſame Mind with them: But I think, no Man ſhould be a Judge in his own Cauſe, and the People are but ſilly Judges. This minds me of the Fable of the Cuckow and the Nightingale, who once contended, who ſhould ſing beſt, the Aſs was made Judge, becauſe it had long Ears: The Nightingale ſung firſt, the Cuckow next: The Aſs's Deciſion was, *Truly the Nightingale ſings pretty well, but for a good, ſweet, plain, taking Song, the Cuckow ſings beſt.*

Pag. 10. When I ſay of the poor Woman in the *North*, who frequently heard Common Prayer, that ſhe expreſt her ſelf thus, " God be thanked for this Gate of it, I " never did remember the Prayers that I heard in the Time of *Biſhops nor Presbyterians* " either: This Book teaches Folk to pray who cannot pray themſelves, and if my Heart " be good, the Words are good. Your anſwer to this is, *This reflects upon the Epiſcopalian as well as the Presbyterian Worſhip.* I anſwer beſides what I have ſaid in my firſt Paper to you: Even, *Let a Friend go with a Foe.* It is impoſſible that a People can be edified, either by the *Scots* Epiſcopalian or Presbyterian Worſhip, as they are by a Book of Common Prayer: Our People are almoſt equally ignorant; but with this Difference, that Epiſcopalians did not preach nor pray Blaſphemie and Nonſenſe as the other Party generally does. I mind a Story of a *Jacobite* Epiſcopal and a *Williamite* Presbyterian Woman, living in a Burgh where I my ſelf lived at the very Time, that a Diſpute aroſe about King *James* and King *William* between them: The *Williamite* Wife ſays, were there no more for King *William* but the 21 *Pſ.* 1, 2. It is enough to ſhew that he is true King, *The King ſhall rejoice in thy Strength, O Lord, for thou haſt put a Crown of pure Gold upon his Head.* This ſays ſhe, cannot be meant of King *James*, for he is not rejoicing the Day, becauſe the Crown is taken off his Head, and put upon King *William*'s. The Epiſcopal Cummer was put to a Bay with this ſtrong Argument; however ſhe delay'd until ſhe got Help another Way; and coming into a Company where I chanc'd to be, ſhe propos'd her Scruple, and ask'd how ſhe could anſwer that Argument: It was told her, that King *William* was not named there: She ask'd then, where was King *James* named in the Bible? It was told her, in the firſt Leaf thereof: And her droll Inſtructer caſt up the Epiſtle Dedicatorie to King *James* the 6th. *To the moſt High and mighty Prince*, James *by the Grace of God, King of* Great-Britain, France. *and* Ireland: At which ſhe clap'd her Hands, ſaying, *O ſtrange Sirs! how get ye theſe Things papped out?* And immediately went off to her Cummer, and ſhewed her, that King *James* was named in the Bible, but King *William* was not; and ſhewing her the Place, made the *Williamite* Wife turn immediately *Jacobite* and confeſs, ſhe never noticed that Paſſage in the Bible.

You ſay, P. 16 *I am aware what a harſh Chapter this muſt be to you, Men being generally more offended, with being called Fools than Knaves, and reſenting more harſhly an Imputation upon their Underſtanding, than upon their Morals. Thou art the moſt ignorant nonſenſical blundering Thing that ever wrote Pamphlets.* Sir, what then has a Man of your vaſt Learning and profound Judgment to do with ſuch a ſtupid Blockhead? I ſee you rather be a witty Villain, and to be accounted a learned Hero, (tho' you were as guilty as ever Major *Weir* was of Sins not to be named) than to be thought a well meaning ſimple honeſt Man. Sir, I do not envy your Choice. The Devil can teach you to be learned, but withal he'll never forbid you to be a *Rebel, Schiſmatick, Lyar, Slanderer, an Accuſer of the Brethren, and a Mocker of Devotion.* My Wiſh is, that you continue no longer in his Fold. Your Reproaches and Praiſes are both alike to me. But I ſhall requite Good for Evil, and ſay, thou art the moſt learned Man in the Iſle of *Britain*; The *Engliſh* Church and Univerſities never produced ſuch a profound Oracle of Wit as thou art; and I believe, I'll get all the ignorant Presbyterians

Digitized by Google

rians in *Scotland* to ſay with me. Sir, I do not think it true, that thou ſays of my ſelf, and that is not great Pride in me; nor do I think it true what thou ſays of thy ſelf, pag. 49, that *thou art one of the meaneſt of the Party*, and that is no great Humility in thee, for thou would take it very ill if another ſaid ſo, which is a Sign of Spiritual Pride.

P. 22, 23. You ſay, that *this Uſage of the Epiſtles and Goſpels was not introduc'd into the Chriſtian Worſhip, till Pope* Damaſus *order'd it, towards the End of the* 4 *Centurie*. And pray, what then? Therefore the Church ſhould not uſe it, becauſe it was brought in by the Pope. At this rate, Presbyterians ſhould lay aſide the ſinging of Pſalms; for it was the ſame Pope brought that in Faſhion in the Weſtern Church. I cite for this the large Dictionary, which you cite, for Mr. *Baxter*'s being pull'd out of the Pulpit, for offering to pray *extempore* at the Reſtoration of King *Charles* II. P. 23, 24 You tell, that I *miſerably miſrepreſented the Words of the Author of the Caſuiſtical Eſſay*. Sir, I have ſet down what he has ſaid, Word by Word. And when I ſay, that no No Notice was taken of the blaſphemous Expreſſions, when complain'd of to the Gen. Aſſ. you have no other Anſwer, but that of Retortion which you condemn in me, to wit, That Mr. *Dodwel*'s Book upon the Mortality of the Soul, was not condemned by the Convocation, which I hear is falſe: But I ſhall inform my ſelf. However I find you frequently anſwer me with Retortions, for which you challenge me for one Retortion to you.

Pag: 24, Your Words are, *Have you forgot*, Sir, *that your Party preach'd up the mad Doctrine of paſſive Obedience and Nonreſiſtance*, &c. You call the Principles and Practice of our bleſſed Saviour, of his Apoſtles, and of the primitive Martyrs for Chriſtianity, *the mad Doctrine of paſſive Obedience*. I confeſs your Principles and Practices are contrary to *Chriſtian Religion*: And corrupt Nature will teach you to reſiſt, altho' the Scripture plainly ſays, that, *he who reſiſteth, receiveth to himſelf Damnation*. You'll put ſuch a carnal Commentary upon it, as will make the Words to run, he that reſiſteth, receiveth to himſelf Salvation. And thus you gave the Rebels at *Pentland Hills*, and *Bothwel Bridge*, Aſſurance of Heaven, to riſe in Rebellion againſt their Sovereign: No wonder then, you be not for the Sign of the Croſs, when you are not for the Doctrine that is ſignified by it.

Ibid. Your Words are, *Have you forgot, what the Dean of Edinburgh ſaid in the Pulpit of St. Giles*, viz. *That ere* Geneva *have it*, Rome *ſhall*: Sir, I never heard it, nor you either, nor any ſufficient Author for you. I knew, he preach'd boldly againſt Popery, when your Party promis'd to be ſilent, as I have given Proof in my Firſt Paper againſt you. If the Dean ſhould ſay, that the Popiſh Clergy have a lawful Ordination, but Presbyterians have not, he might ſay ſo with Knowledge and Conſcience; for I have already proven, That *Samuel Rutherfoord*, and others of your Champions, acknowledge the Firſt, to wit, That they have lawful Ordination. But we cannot ſay, that you have, and we can prove, you have not Ordination; and conſequently, that there is a Nullity in your uſurped, ſelf-ſending, ſelf-ſeeking Miniſtry. Pag. 26 Your Words are, *You likewiſe repreſent* James Stuart *as a moſt cruel Perſecutor of the Epiſcopal Clergy. So true is the old Saying*, Perit quod facis ingrato. I repreſent him, as pleading ſtrongly for a Toleration to the Papiſts in his Letter to *Myn Heer Fagel*, and yet acting quite contrary ſince the Revolution. By your Words, *Perit quod facis ingrato: It is loſt what is done to an unthankful Perſon*; You would inſinuate, that I was under Obligations to him. I know nothing of that, except to mind him and you both in the Words of the *Litany* when we ſay, *That it may pleaſe thee to forgive our Enemies, Perſecutors, and Slanderers, and to turn their Hearts*. He kept me Eleven Months Priſoner in the Tolbooth of *Edinburgh*, ſix before I got an Indictment or an Hearing before the Juſticiary: And when I was aſſoilzied from the Crime of Treaſon, he was enraged at the Lords, becauſe he got me not made a Sacrifice to the Presbyterian Fury. At length, he fought a Month to bring in other Things againſt me, and from that Time, I was delay'd Five Months; & in the time, he ſent up an Account of the whole Trial to the Court, and deſir'd an Order to have me proceſs'd over again, which was deny'd at Court. The true Hiſtory of this may be publiſh'd before he or I die. After that, I went to live quietly in the *North*, I was twice ſummoned by him from *Aberdeen*; and at laſt baniſh'd 12 Miles from the Place, for preaching in my own Houſe. And going thence to my Native Country, to live in *Elgin* of *Murray*; I was Three Times charg'd at the Inſtance of the Agent of the Kirk with his Concurrence; and at laſt ſilenced from Preaching Twenty Miles about the Place. Now, Mr. *Anderſon*, Where is the Obli-

gation

Digitized by Google

gation? If all your Informations be like this, the Kingdom will find you extremely impos'd upon; but I perceive, you are resolved to do Service to your Party right or wrong.

I remember, that in the Time of my Imprisonment 1693, one *Margaret Stephen*, the Captain of the *White Regiment*, came into the City, to get Sir *Robert Hamilton* out of the Prison, who was kept in for avowed high Treason; yet by her Authority, his Liberty was easily procured, altho' he was resolved never to Petition for his Releasment. When he with his Accomplices got out, they left a Declaration in the Clerk of the Tolbooth's Hand, to this Purpose, That if any did petition the pretended King, or the pretended Council, *&c.* in their Names for their Liberty, that it was done without their Knowledge; for they did not own such an Authority. The Advocate, getting this in his Hand at Night, burnt it at the Candle, that it might not rise in Judgment against them. So true is the Proverb, *Shew me the Man, and I shall shew you the Law,*

This Godly She Captain, came in very civilly to Dr. *C.* and me, who were both Prisoners, and was very cheerful with us, and with our Company, and told us, she got out Sir *Robert*, and she should get us out too, if we were for *Jesus Christ his Crown, and Government*, tho' she should go to King *William* her self: And breaking out in a canting Strain, she cries out, *Oh, wo's me, Sirs, you are all the Children of* Edom; *ill was the Taylor that shaped your Consciences, for I'll prove that, Did not* Adam *take Fig-Tree Leaves, is not that your Consciences, Sirs?* Yet I must do her Justice, and declare, that we could not find her speak ill of any particular Person of the Episcopal Clergy. For when we enquired, what she knew of the Arch-Bishops and Ministers of *Glasgow*, expecting nothing but Calumny and Slander? Truly, says she, they were all very good honest Men; and not an ill Character had she of any of them. I believe it was not with a Design to flatter the Company, but an honest Simplicity, hating to speak ill of any Person; which is very much to be admir'd in any ignorant Bigot of that Party, especially when their Leaders can neither preach nor pray without Slander and evil Speaking. I thought, the poor Body had a well natur'd Temper, but that Presbyterian Principles confounded and sowred it in a great Part.

Page 27. You affirm it to be a monstrous Lie, to say, *That the Church of* England *keeps the Thirtieth of* January, *to expose the Presbyterians; you desire the Reader to peruse the Office for the Day, and see if Presbyterians be so much as mention'd therein.* I desire the same Reader to peruse the Office of the *Gun-Powder Treason* for the 5th of *November*, and see if there be any Mention of a Papist in all that Office, and yet who will deny but the Papists were the Actors of that Treason?

Ibid. You tell, Presbyterians are not indeed for keeping Anniversaries. You should have added, except an Anniversary in *Heriot*'s Work, once a Year, for which they get an Hundred Merks, a new Hat, and a Bible.

Ibid. *But to this Day I never met with a Presbyterian, that did not acknowledge, that the Death off King* Charles *was a Murther, and that a barbarous Murther.* This is as false as any Thing you have said, and that is false enough. For who knew the Presbyterian Principles and Practices better than *the Author of the Hynd let loose*, who avows and justifies the Action, and was in this Revolution preferred to be Minister (so called) at St. *Andrews*, wherein is the chief University in the Nation, for Theology and Philosophy. And he sent thither to poyson the Youth with Presbytery, in the strictest Sense. Who was it excommunicated and executed *Montrose*, who appeared for the King in the Field? Who made them stand in Sackcloth, that went into the unlawful Engagement, as they call'd, fighting for him? Was it not the Presbyterians? Your Brethren the Independants say truly, *We took off* Charles Stuart's *Head, but you Presbyterians took of the King's Head.* You took away his Power, but they took away his Life. The *Solemn League and Covenant, the Act of the West-Kirk*, and the Penitentials of the Synod of *Aberdeen*, will prove to a Demonstration, who had the first and chief Hand in this Murther. You never abjured or renounced the Principles by which that bloody Murther was acted, but of this more particularly hereafter.

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of Obſervations on Mr. Anderſon's Excurſions, &c.

PAGE 28, 29. When it is told you, *That* Faithful Cumin *a Monk, and* Thomas Heath *a Jeſuite, were the Firſt that brought Extemporarie Prayers in Faſhion.* ---- To this you ſay, That *the Hiſtory of* England *makes this a Lye: For the Puritans, and ſuch as were diſaffected to the Liturgy, were a potent Party in the End of King* Edward VI's *Reign.* ---- My Anſwer is, You will find, that the Puritans and old Non-conformiſts were not Enemies to ſett Forms of Prayer, tho' they were to Ceremonies. But this Monk and Jeſuite were againſt compos'd Prayer altogether. But more of this hereafter in my Collection of Foreign and Britiſh Presbyterians Sentiments, wherein the *Scots* Kirk differs from the Church of *England.*

Pag. 30. When in a Miſtake I cite the 6th Canon for the 6th Article of the Church of *England*, you inſult in theſe Words, *Such is your Ignorance, that you cannot diſtinguiſh betwixt the Eccleſiaſtical Canons and Articles of Religion.* It behoved you to ſpeak ſo to pleaſe your Party, that they might have an high Opinion of you. Sure I can read the one as well as the other: There is no Miſtake in the Subſtance. Your *Crimine ex uno diſce omnes*, in the Title Page of your Book, is a far greater Miſtake; and yet I do not think it worth the quarrelling. I remember, that Arch-Biſhop *Spotiſwood* in his Hiſtory, and Biſhop *Taylor* in his *Ductor Dubitantium*, relate a Story of the peeviſh, proud, litigious Temper of the Presbyterians, who appointed a Faſt on that very Day, which King *James* VIth appointed to be a Feſtival for treating of a King's Ambaſſadour, the one calls it the King of *Denmark*'s, the other the King of *France*'s Ambaſſadour; one of them was wrong in the Circumſtance, but both true in the Subſtance of the Story. Again, it is told of Mr. *David Williamſon*, that in his Eſcape from the King's Troops, he ſhelter'd himſelf in a Bed with a Lady's Daughter, which the Searchers in Diſcretion paſs'd by, for Fear of frighting the young Lady. This Story is told of Mr. *David*, but it is falſe, for that Lady had no Daughter, but it is as true that it was the Lady's Niece.

Page 32. You cannot paſs by a civil Compliment upon a learned Man, Mr. *Falkner* whom I call Doctor, who ſurely is called ſo, moſt deſervedly, by ſeveral learned Men. Your witty Ironie upon this is, *All your Writers muſt be Doctors*, Doctores a docendo, quemadmodum montes a movendo. --- I anſwer, You are very excellent at critical Grammatications and pedantick Punns, which minds me of a Brother of yours, who to ſhow his learning upon the Word, *Lord*, held out near half an Hour upon the Latin Word, *Dominus*. This (ſays he) Sirs is a rich Word, for 1. it ſignifies *Do minus*; God gives more or leſs as he pleaſeth himſelf. 2. *Do manus*; the Lord takes ſome by the Hand, and he rejects others. 3. *Do munus*; God giveth Gifts to all Men. 4. *Do minas*; God threatens the Malignants of the World. 5. *Do minas*; God gives *Mark-pieces* to the Godly who are perſecuted in the World. --- Your Brethren have abounded with pretty Punns, and Clinks, and Clenches upon Words; as one preaching againſt *Yule-day*, crys out thus, You'll ſay, Sirs, *Good old Yule-day*, I ſay, *good old fool Day.* You'll ſay, it is a brave *halie Day*; I tell you, *it is a brave Belly Day.* You'll ſay, *theſe are bony Formalities*; I tell you, *theſe are bony Fartalities.* ---- Another learned Brother at a Catechiſing, told, *Yule-Day* was derived thus, There was a certain Man hang'd his Dog on the 25 of *December*; the Creature was Three Hours hung, at laſt the Cord was looſed, and the Dog lived; and running off, cry'd, *Ule, Ule, Ule*, and hence, ſays he, came the Word, *Yule, Yule, Yule.* --- Another long ago in *England* preaching upon the Word, *Repent*, began his Preface thus, "Dearly beloved, I brought "you hither the Day, ſome fine Biskets baken in the Oven of Charity, for the Chickens "of the Church, for the Sparrows of the Spirit, and the ſweet Swallows of Salvation. "Alas! now a days, all Houſes are turn'd into Ale-houſes; our Cares are turn'd into "*Cards*; *our Paradiſe to a Pair of Dice*; our Marriage into a merry Age; *our Ma-*"*trimony into Matter of Money*; our Wedlock into, we had Luck; *our Pedagogues, into* "*Petri Gouks*; our Chaplains into Cheap-lowns. It was not ſo in the Days of *Noah*; "Ah no! But *Repent*, Sirs, is a rich Word, every Letter exhorts us to a Duty, R. Rea-

"dily,

Digitized by Google

" dily, E. Earneſtly, P. Preſently, E. Early, N. Nationally, T. Throughly. Again,
" R. Rarely, E. Elegantly, P. Prettily, E. Evenly, N. Neatly, T. Tightly.

I ſhall end with another Story relative to your *Doctores a docendo, &c.* There was one Mr. *Butcher* ſome Years ago in *Bedlam*, who for his Divertiſement, was ſtill reading *Ovid*'s Lamentations, which begin thus, *Parve nec invideo, &c.* A Friend of mine ask'd him, what Pleaſure he took in reading that Book more than any other? He reply'd, that *Ovid* was his Couſin. It was ask'd him, how ſo? He anſwered, does not *Ovidius* come from *Ovis*, a Sheep? and Butchers uſe to take Sheep by the Neck; therefore *Ovid* began his Book with, *Parve nec.*

Page 49. Speaking of your ſelf you ſay, *I am one of the meaneſt of the Party, and I take up your Gauntlet; for who is this uncircumciſed Philiſtin?* —— Sir, what are the learnedeſt among you, when you are one of the meaneſt? When you, who treat the learnedeſt Doctors of Divinity in *England*, as if they were your Underlings, and not worthy to cary your Books, to ſay, that you are one of the meaneſt of the Presbyterian Kirk in *Scotland*, ſhews more of Falſhood than of Truth; and of Pride than of Humility. It was Humility indeed in St. *Paul*, to call himſelf the *Chief of Sinners*; becauſe he once was ſo, when a Perſecutor of the Church of God, but was not ſo after his Converſion. Sir, if you were one of the meaneſt, perhaps you might gain more Admirers and Proſelytes, to giddy and wild Opinions. I ſhall give an Inſtance of one who could not read a Chapter in the Bible rightly, and was not many Degrees from an Idiot, yet wanted not his Followers and Admirers among the ignorant Commons, who were not inſtructed in the ſolid Points of the Chriſtian Religion. I ſhall give you a Swatch (to ſpeak in your own Dialect) of his Converſation with my ſelf; as ſome of my Presbyterian Acquaintances can atteſt an Hundred Inſtances of this Nature.

I ſhall ſet down one Dialogue betwixt him and me, as we had many Times Stuff of this Kind of Nonſenſe. And ſhall for Diſtinction's ſake mark it with the Letter *C.* in my own Name, and *Mp.* in his Name. Thus as it was before ſeveral Witneſſes, he thinking in the mean Time that he ſpoke profound Senſe, and not diſcovering that I ſpoke Nonſenſe. *C.* Couſin, whether was King *David* a Papiſt or a Proteſtant? *Mp.* Indeed King *David* was a Proteſtant. *C.* How will you prove that? *Mp.* Read the 33 Chapter of *Gen.* and you'll find it. *C.* How can that be, when the *Jews* had not the Points? *Mp.* The Points! indeed had they, had they; read the 35 Chapter of *Gen.* *C.* How can that be, when *Ovid* ſays, *Hanc tua Penelope, &c.* *Mp.* For that read the 1 of *Sam.* 15 Chap. and that will clear you. Much Nonſenſe had we to this Purpoſe; and the Witneſſes declaring this to a learned Doctor and Profeſſor of Divinity, he thought it altogether Romance, and that *Mp.* was but jeſting as well as *C.* At length, when this was out of the honeſt, learned and grave Doctor's Head, I called him over to my Houſe, where I had *Mp.* my Collocutor, who look'd very gravely, and I ſpoke to the learned Profeſſor thus, Doctor, this Gentleman and I cannot agree upon the Head of Epiſcopacy, I am arguing him with that Scripture, *He that deſires the Office of a Biſhop, deſires a good Work*, which gave Occaſion to the following Dialogue betwixt D. *W.* and *Mp.* And firſt D. *W.* ſaid, I hope the Gentleman does not think Epiſcopacy abſolutely unlawful; for it is not probable that the Government of Heaven would ſuffer the Chriſtian Church to be deceived for Fifeteen Hundred Years, under ſuch a Government if it were unlawful. Whereupon *Mp.* cry'd out, Wo's me, you a gray-haird Man going to the Devil with the Reſt. Do you think Epiſcopacy lawful? Then the Doctor, not imagining that he was dealing with an half Idiot, ſays, How know you I am going to the Devil? That is like Presbyterian Charity and Civility: But what ſay you to that ſame Argument, *He that deſires the Office of a Biſhop?* *Mp.* Truly that is not your Lord Biſhops. D. *W.* Then your Quarrel at them is, for being Lords and not being Biſhops: But Lordſhip is not of the Eſſence of Epiſcopacy. And why may not the Chriſtian Clergy have honourable Titles, as well as the *Jewiſh* Clergy? Do not you find, 2 *Kings* 5 Chap. that *Eliſha* was called *My Lord*, by a great Courtier *Naaman*? Why may not Chriſtian Clergymen be called, *My Lords*, eſpecially when the Fountain of Honour is pleas'd to confer that upon them? *Mp.* Indeed, *Eliſha* was not a *Scotch* Biſhop. D. *W. Scotch* Biſhop! (ſays he, being in a Paſſion at ſuch Nonſenſe; whileas the conceited Fool all the Time never moved himſelf) what is your Quarrel with *Scotch* Biſhops? *Mp.* Truly they broke God's *Covenant in Horeb.* D. *W. Horeb!* Were ever the *Scotch* Biſhops in *Horeb*? Truly were they. The Doctor, finding him ſpeak Nonſenſe to the Scripture, would bring

Digitized by Google

bring him on to the Fathers; and there he was put out as well as in the Scriptures. D. *W.* says, Do not you read what a great Compliment St. *Jerom* gives to St. *Auguſtine* Biſhop of *Hippo*; and yet you pretend, St. *Jerom* is on your Side? *Mp.* Indeed do I. D. *W.* Where do you read it? *Mp.* 23 *Jeremiah.* D. *W.* It is *Jerom* the Father who lived in the 4th *Cent.* that I ſpeak of. *Mp.* Well, 'tis *Jerom* the Father that I ſpeak of too. D. *W.* Do you read that in the 23 of *Jeremiah*? *Mp.* Indeed do I. D. *W.* I think you ken not what you are ſaying. *Mp.* I think you ken not what you are ſaying. D. *W.* upon this gave over further Reaſoning with him, and ſaid, Truly, the Scripture ought not to be given to ſuch as you. *Mp.* Truly it ought not to be given to ſuch as you. Thereafter *Mp.* turns the Chaſe againſt D. *W.* and began to debate with him thus. *Mp.* Do not you read of *Baal* in the Bible? D. *W.* Yes. *Mp.* Do not you read of *Aſhtaroth*? D. *W.* Yes. *Mp.* Well then, are not theſe *Scotch* Biſhops. D. *W.* at this Nonſenſe left the Room: And I never ſaw a Man ſo beaten in my Life-time. Yea in the Judgment of the Populace, he would carry the Vogue from all the Biſhops and Doctors in *England.*

I add another Story of this Body, when *Anno* 1693 I was a Priſoner, he payed me a Viſit, and told me, he was very ſorry that I was in Priſon for Two Devils: I asked him, what two Devils? He anſwered, King *James* and the Biſhops. I asked him, what he would have me to do? He anſwered, I would have you quite the Devil and make your Covenant with Chriſt. Wou'd you (ſaid I) have me ſubſcribe the Solemn League and Covenant? Indeed would I, ſaid he. Is it, ſaid I, in the Bible? Indeed is it, ſaid he. It was askt him, in what Place? He anſwered, it was in the 5th Ch. of *Deut*: (For ſtill he named any Chapter that came in his Head, and believed he was ſpeaking irriſiſtible Senſe all the Time; and that he was able for all the Doctors of Divinity in *Britain.*) I asked him, Did ever *Deuteronomy* ſubſcribe the Covenant? Indeed did he, ſaid he, I wiſh you were all as good Men as *Deuteronomy* was.

I do not publiſh this Story to reflect upon the Whigs; for ſeverals of my Presbyterian Friends and Acquaintances, knew the Man, and knew this and Twenty other Stories of this Nature to be Truth; and took their Sport of him as well as I: But I do it to ſhew the World, how eaſily poor People are deceived by ignorant Guides. It lay in this Man's Hand to break the learnedeſt Presbyterian's Congregation in the Kingdom, with his little ſtarch'd Gravity, and his Apiſh Imitation of thoſe who place a great deal of Spirituality in wry Mouths, ugly Faces, wheening and canting Tones, which many look upon as Signs of Grace, tho they take an unaccountable Liberty of Lying, Slandering, and reviling their Neighbours. They perhaps will not ſwear for a World; but they'll cheat for a Peny. What a pitiful Thing is it then to ſtudy and purſue the Applauſe of the People, and the Acclamations of the Rabble, who are ignorant, giddy, fickle and changeable, following every Wind of vain Doctrine? How many have the People canoniz'd for Saints, whom God has damn'd for incarnate Devils: The poor Publican was a Reprobate in the Opinion of the People; and the proud Phariſee was of the Election of Grace: But our Saviour was of a contrary Mind. Wo then will be to thoſe Guides, who make it their Buſineſs, to have their Perſons in Admiration with the People; and ſad is the Condition of the People, who are blindfolded with ſuch Guides. It lay in the Power of this Body, whom I have mentioned, to hound out a Rabble upon a Curate, and to tell that the Curate deſerved to be roughly treated, for he is *Arminian.* And if it were asked what an *Arminian* is? he would tell, that he is a Man that aſſerts, that God made the greater Part of Mankind purpoſely to damn them, the People would receive this for good Coin. Many Stories of this Nature could be told, I remember in the City of *Edinburgh*, when the Presbyterian Teachers were railing and raving againſt the Book of Common Prayer, that one among the Reſt ſaid, that the Liturgiſts, in their Kneeling at the Communion, adored the Bread and Wine; and a Merchant in the City, who came into a Stationer's Shop, and fell upon the Book of Common Prayer, accuſing the Church of *England* of Idolatry, a Perſon that was preſent told him, that the Church of *England* profeſs'd and proteſted to the contrary; and that it did not kneel To the Sacrament but At it, and produced the 28th Article againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, and ſeveral Things to that Purpoſe. The Presbyterian Believer told him, He would believe his Teacher better than all the Church of *England.* Which exactly put me in mind of the Command that the *Jewiſh* Guides had over the Conſciences of theſe, that watch'd the holy Grave, tho' with their Eyes they ſaw the Reſurrection, yet contrary to their Sight, Knowledge and Conſcience they were made to ſay, that his Diſciples ſtole him away by Night: And no doubt, but they believed this at laſt themſelves. Sad Guides are theſe, who cheat the People

out

Digitized by Google

out of their Souls, and the Means of their Edification; and no better Means than a *Form of ſound Words*, a Liturgy, frequent Communion, and reading of the Scriptures: All which are vehemently and furiouſly oppoſed by our *Scots* Kirkmen. No better can be expected of a ſchiſmatical Crew, where they may pray *Arianiſm*, *Socinianiſm*, or any Hereſy whatſoever, for ought the implicite and deluded People can diſcern: But let a Liturgiſt be Ignorant or Heretical, he cannot wrong a fix'd Worſhip, by his Weakneſs or wrong Opinion. I do truly fear, that the *Jeſuites* are not ſo much at the bottom of this, as the *Deiſts* who deny Reveal'd Religion; and the *Socinians*, that deny the Divinity of our Saviour, and ſo deſervedly are called *baptiz'd Turks*. And no better Tools for their Deſign than Presbyterians and other Sectarians, to bring us into *Mahumetiſm*: For I read in a very learned Author, that there was a Deſign to enlarge the Proteſtant Communion by joining with the *Turks*; and they gave theſe Reaſons for it, That the *Turks* believed one God; they acknowledged Chriſt was a great Prophet; they were for abſolute Predeſtination; and they hated Popery.

I ſhall give theſe few following Inſtances of the Credulity of theſe implicite People, and then conclude. 1. Mr. *John Ainſly*, Miniſter of *Oxnam* in *Teviotdale*, was, at the Revolution, content to go in to Presbytry, and by his Friends made Intereſt with Mr. *Gabriel Semple*, Incumbent at *Jedburgh*. When Mr. *Gabriel* found Mr. *Ainſly* in earneſt upon the Matter, he diſclos'd his Mind freely to him, and ſaid, 'You that are 'Curates were not half wiſe; for you ſtudied to pleaſe your Patrons, Lairds and La-'dies; but we ſtudied to pleaſe the People, who have many Tongues, many Eyes, 'and many Hands; and ſo having the Multitude on our Side, we are fix'd againſt 'a few Oppoſers: And the beſt Politick I can recommend to you is, to make your 'Intereſt with *Dandie Bell* and *Meggie Lorrain*; and when you have made your Peace 'with them, you are ſure of us." Now this *Dandie Bell* was a *Cameronian* Weaver in *Jedburgh*; and *Meggie Lorrain* a Midwife in the Country. At which poor Mr. *Ainſly* was very much dejected, and went Home, repenting that he took not his Share of Suffering with the fixt and perſevering Clergy, who preferr'd afflicted Truths to proſperous Errors, and died ſoon thereafter. This Story he told to ſeveral Brethren with an Aſſeveration to the Truth of it. So true it is to this very Day, what the Apoſtle ſays, *Rom.* xvi. 17, 18. *With good Words and fair Speeches, they deceive the Hearts of the Simple*, call them *Godly*, and *known Seekers of God*: Their Leaders are ſure of their Tongues to Slander, and of their Hands to Rabble the Miniſters of the Goſpel.

2. If the *Whig* Teacher ſhall tell, That Biſhops are cloven-footed like the Devil, this is believed: And it can be proven, that this was ſpread among the *Whig* implicite Commons; and that Biſhops were to loſe 500 Merks for every Witch that ſhould be burnt upon that Account.

3. The *Whigs* ſpread a Report, that General *Dalziel* was in Compact with the Devil; and in Sign and Token thereof, that the General had not a Shadow: This was believed by the Phanaticks; and when they ſaw him upon the Streets in a Sun-ſhine, they would not believe that he had a Shadow, tho' they ſaw it with their Eyes.

4. They alſo ſpread a Report, That the Mother of this King of *France* was not delivered of him till Thirteen Months after the Death of her Husband: This likewiſe was believed, tho' the Duke of *Orleans*, his Brother, was Three Years younger, and born of the ſame Mother, and the ſame Husband lived till that time. But every thing is taken for a Divine Oracle, that is pronounced out of a *Whig* Teacher's Mouth.

We ſee then what a Paſs the People are brought to, by the want of a ſolid Worſhip. I conclude with Mr. *Baxter*'s Obſervation, in his *Cure of Church Diviſions: How often have I known the ableſt Preacher undervalued, and an ignorant Man by Crowds applauded, merely for the loudneſs of his Voice; whilſt I, who have been acquainted with the Preacher, have known him to be unable to anſwer moſt Queſtions in the common Catechiſm.*

The Reader is deſired to notice, That in the laſt Number *(viz.* Numb. XII.) Pag. 50. Lin. 35. *there is ſomething omitted: For it is there ſaid, That there is no mention of a Papiſt in the Office for the 5th of* November; *what follows ſhould be added,* Except once in one Collect; And for that, when we read of *Cruel and Unreaſonable Men*, in the Office of the 30th of *January*, and of *unnatural Rebellion, Uſurpation and Tyranny of ungodly and cruel Men*; it is well known, the Church of *England* means the *Presbyterians* and *Independants*; as ſhall be made appear hereafter.

An

Digitized by Google

An Appeal *to* Calvin's *Tribunal, as to the Hierarchy, Liturgy, and Ceremonies of the Church of* England.

OR

Thomas Long's *Calvinus Redivivus* COMPENDIZ'D.

Calvin's *Sentiments of the Creed in general, and of Two Articles in particular.*

I Find it to be pernicious beyond Measure, that Men do so presume of their own Judgments, as to think all their Opinions firm and true, before ever they weigh them, and are so confident as to refuse Communication with learned Men. As to the *Creed*, which I also call the Apostles, not troubling my self with the Author of it, I find, by a great Agreement among the Ancients, it is certainly ascribed to the Apostles; whether they thought it to be written and delivered by the Apostles in common, or because they thought to confirm, by such an Appellation, that Summary of Faith, which was sincerely collected out of the Doctrine by them delivered. For I do not in the least doubt, from whomsoever it first came, that from the very first Infancy of the Church, and so in the very Age wherein the Apostles lived, it was received as the publick Confession, approved by the Consent of all: Neither is it probable, that it was written by any private Man; forasmuch as it appears from the very first Records, that it was esteemed to be of sacred Authority among all good Men.

Calv. *Epist.* 303. *Instit. L.* 2. *C.* 6. *S.* 18.

Calvin's *Sense of that Article of the Creed,* The Holy Catholick Church, and the Communion of Saints.

IN the Creed, where we do profess to believe the Church, it is not sufficient, that I believe the Company of God's Elect, unless I apprehend such an Unity of the Church, into which I am verily perswaded, that I am ingrafted and made a Member of the same. For this Article of the Creed belongs to the external or visible Church, that every one may contain himself in a brotherly Agreement with all the Children of God, giving to the Church it's due Authority, and behaving himself as a Sheep of that Fold; And therefore is that Article of *The Communion of Saints*, adjoined; which intimates, that the Saints are gathered unto the Society of Christ, to this End, That whatever Blessings God bestoweth on them, should be communicated to each other. Now this Communion with the Church, brings us into the Society of God; and how profitable and necessary the Knowledge of this is, the very Name of Mother, given to the Church visible, may teach us, seeing there is no other way of entering into Life, unless she form us in her Bowels, and nourish us with her own Breasts, and unless we live under her Tuition and Government, until we lay aside Mortality. For out of the Embraces of this Church, no Remission of Sins is to be hoped, nor Salvation to be had. In many Places of Scripture, the fatherly Love of God is restrained to His Flock; so that the Departure from that, is always destructive: For God has obliged us to His ordinary Manner of Teaching, which while Fanatick Men do refuse, they involve themselves in many deadly Snares; and they are devilish Spirits that study to destroy the Unity of the Church.

Lib. 4. *C.* 1. *S.* 72. *S.* 3. *S.* 4. *Is.* 37. 32. *Joel* 2. 32. *Ezek.* 13. 9. *Psal.* 106. 4. *S.* 5. *S.* 9.

Cal-

Digitized by Google

Calvin's *Notes of a True Church.*

I Approve of these Marks of the visible Church: *First*, Pure Doctrine. *Secondly*, The right Use of the Sacraments. And, *Thirdly*, a Holy Unity depending thereupon.

Calv. *de vera Eccles. Reform. P.* 322.

Calvin's *Judgment of such Parochial Churches as are now constituted in the Church of* England.

THose Congregations that are settled in Towns or Villages (as human Necessities do require) have justly both the Name and Authority of a Church, as being in Communion with the Church Universal; and to despise the Authority of such a Church, to scorn her Admonitions, to be refractory to her Counsels, and mock at her Corrections, is not without Guilt, much less to separate from it, and break it's Unity: For God doth so value the Communion of His Church, that He judgeth him an Apostate from Religion, that shall contumaciously withdraw himself from the Society of such a Church; and no Crime can be conceived greater than such sacrilegious Unfaithfulness, whereby we violate that Covenant which the Son of God vouchsafed to make with us. Therefore those Things which God hath joined, no Man may separate, *viz.* That to whom he is a Father, the Church also be a Mother. Where ever there is a Minister rightly constituted, who faithfully discharges his Office, every one that will be accounted a Christian, ought to adhere to him, and to enjoy his Ministry with the rest of the Flock: But what do they? Because we follow not them in their Errors, altho' we purely preach the Word of God, they account us as ravenous Wolves; and they so abhor us, that they think they should commit a deadly Sin, to be present at our Sermons; therefore they create inferior Ministers, and being made in a Moment, are imployed to rend the Church, divide the People, and gather Congregations contrary to one another, that the Name of God may not be invocated with the joint Consent of all, and with that Concord which becomes it.

Calv. *Inst. l.* 4. *C.* 1. *S.* 9. *S.* 10. *Inst. L.* 4. *C.* 1. *S.* 1. Calv. *contra* Anabapt.

Calvin's *Resolve anent Protestant Bishops, particularly* his *acknowledging the* Romish *Church to be a true one.*

I Granted to Cardinal *Sadolet*, that the Churches under his Jurisdiction were the Churches of Christ, and the Reason of my Judgment in this Particular I have given at large in my Institutions. The Sum whereof is this. No Man well in his Wits, ever held that Christianity was quite extinguished, whersoever the *Romish* Tyranny did prevail: Whence it follows, That in some Respects there is a Church yet remaining. As in *Israel* when Idolatry prevail'd under *Jeroboam* and *Rehoboam*, good Men had a tolerable Estate of a Church for Circumcision, and the Law, and Sacrifices, and Invocation of God remained: So I willingly grant, that in *Rome* God hath preserved some Footsteps of a Church, as when a Building is demolished, the Foundation and Ruines remain: Besides, how else should we prove the Pope to be Antichrist, unless we grant him to sit in the Temple of God, as the Prophets foretold he should? For his Kingdom doth not abolish the Name of *Christ* or of a Church; God hath there preserved some Remnants of his People, and Symbols of his Church, which the Subtilty of the Devil, nor the Impiety of Men could not destroy; however, they are so miserably prophaned, corrupted, poisoned, that they want the lawful Form of a Church properly so called.

Calv. *ad* Sadolet. *Lib.* 4. *C.* 2. *S.* 9, 10, 11, 12. *Dan.* 9. 27. 2 *Thess.* 2. 4.

Cal-

Digitized by Google

Calvin's *Opinion of those who communicate in the Ordinances of God with wicked Men.*

THE Church of God is called holy, but not perfect; Christ is and will be still purging of it, until he present it without Spot and Wrinkle. You hear the Parable of the Net, and of the Tares, and of the Chaff, by which our Saviour shows, that there will be a Mixture of good and bad in the Church, to the End of the World. For a full Answer to this Question, consider the Church of *Corinth*, among whom there were not a few that erred, but Polution had almost over-run the whole Body: There was not one Kind of Sin but many; nor were they light Errors, but certain horrid Enormities: There was not only Corruption of Manners, but of Doctrine. What doth the holy Apostle in this Case, who was the Instrument of the Holy Ghost; at whose Testimony the Church stands or falls? Doth he endeavour Separation from them? Doth he expel them from the Kingdom of Christ? Or strick them with the fatal Thunderbolt of an Anathema? He doth not only forbear these Methods, but he both owns and declares them to be a Church of Christ; and a Society of Saints: If there were a Church in *Corinth*, where contentious Sects and Emulations were so hot, where Strife and Brawling with covetous Desires did grow, where a Wickedness abominable (even to the Heathen) was publickly approved, where the Name of *Paul* was wantonly abused, whom they ought to have reverenc'd as a Father, where some laughed at the Resurrection of the Dead; with the Denial of which the whole Gospel fell: Where they served Ambition, not Charity; where most Things were acted indecently and inordinately (and yet it remains, the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments was not to be refused.) Who dares to take from them the Title of a Church, where the tenth Part of such Vices cannot be fastned? To separate from a Church for this Reason, as it is a Sin to which we are prone, so it is a subtle Device of the Devil. There have ever been some, who being conceited of their own Holiness, as so many aerial Spirits, despise the Communion of all, in whom they perceive any human Infirmities: Such were the *Catharists* and *Donatists* of old, and the *Anabaptists* now, whose morose Humours proceed rather from Pride and a false Opinion of Holiness, than from a true Endeavour of Sanctity; and lest it should appear, that they want the Light of Truth, they make Use of the Shadow of rigid Severity, to whom I commend the Advice of St. *Augustine*, That they charitably amend what they can, and patiently endure what they cannot, and in Love sigh and lament until God amend all. But when under a Pretence of Zeal for Perfection, we cannot dispense with any Imperfection in the Body, or Members of the Church, then we are to be admonished, that the Devil swells us with Pride, and seduceth us by Hypocrisy to desert the Flock of Christ.

Matth. 13. *Matth.* 3. 12. 1 *Cor.* 11. *C.* 3. 3. *C.* 5. 1. *C.* 6. 7. *C.* 9. 1. *C.* 15. 12. Calv. *Inst. C.* 4. 8. 7. 12. *Inst. Lib.* 4. *C.* 1. *S.* 12. 13. Calvin. *adversus Anabaptistas.*

Calvin's *Opinion of such Churches as have some Errors mixed with the preaching of the Word.*

THE Doctrine of the Church is either that which is absolutely necessary to be known, as that there is a God, that Christ is God, *&c.* or that Part which is less necessary, which may be controverted in the Church, and yet not destroy the Unity of Faith. As for Instance, Suppose that some hold, that the Souls of Men do not go immediately to Heaven, yet do grant they live unto God, but determine not of the Place: The Apostle *Phil.* 3. 15. plainly sheweth, that such Dissent in Points of Doctrine not necessary, are no Ground for Division; some Faults may be discovered both in Doctrine and Administration of Sacraments, which yet ought not to alienate us, from the Communion of the Church. It is indeed a great Fault, when either through Carelessness or Indulgence, or want of Authority, the Minister doth not do his Office, in purging the Church; which the Apostle greatly blames in the *Corinthians*, but tho' the Church be tardy in it's Office, it is not lawful for every private Man presently to reso've on Separation: You may avoid the familiar Society of such wicked Men, but not desert the Communion of the Church. And tho' some Men, through an inconsiderate Zeal, may be faulty in this Respect; yet we shall ordinarly find this great Mo-

ro-

Digitized by Google

rosity to arise, rather from Pride and Disdain, or a false Opinion of Sanctity, than from true Holiness, or a sincere Endeavour to promote it, there ought to be so great an Abhorrence of Schism amongst Christians, that they alway fly from it as far as possibly they can: They ought to have so great a Reverence of the Ministry and Sacraments, that wherever they perceive these to be, they think the Church to be there. This I earnestly perswade, that Schisms do not divide any Church; which, tho' it may be corrupt in Manners, and infected with strange Doctrines, yet it is not wholly departed from that Doctrine, on which St. *Paul* teacheth the Church of Christ to be founded. This therefore I must still lament, as one of the greatest Evils of our Times, that one Church is so divided from another, that scarce any human Society is maintained among us; much less doth the holy Communion of the Members of Christ appear among us; which, tho' all profess with their Mouths, very few do in Truth sincerely practise.

Calvin. Inst: L: 4. C: 1. S: 12. S: 15. Ep: 11. Ep: 12. Ep. 126. to *Cranmer.*

Calvin's *Opinion of the Doctrine of the Church of* England.

I Am so far from objecting any Thing against the Doctrine there professed, that I rather give God Thanks, who hath so illuminated them with the Knowledge of sound Doctrine, that the chief Magistrate takes Care to have it publickly preached; and it was my Advice, that Care should be taken of unstable (or desultory) Witts, and Provision made to keep out curious Doctrines, (and I think their Articles have done both. In composing of which, I know the *English* Reformers had Respect to the *Augustine* Confession, as, by comparing them, may appear. And I, who did subscribe the one, cannot disswade you from subscribing the other.)

Calvin: Epist: 87. The 39 Articles were Printed two Years before *Calvin's* Death.

Calvin's *Opinion of the Limitation of Ministers in the Exercise of their Gifts.*

I Think it a Means to remedy many Evils, if there be composed a Summary of Doctrine, to be received by all; which all Ministers should observe in their Preaching; which all the Bishops and Parochial Ministers should be obliged by Oath to observe; so as none should be admitted to any Ecclesiastical Office, unless he should subscribe to keep that Harmony of Doctrine inviolated; and this is the Practice of most reformed Churches. In this Church of *Geneva* it was provided, That if any One should spread Opinions, contrary to the Doctrine received in the Church; let him first be admonished in a brotherly Manner; if he acquiesce, let him be forgiven without any Note of Infamy; if he be contumacious, and obstinately addicted to his Error, let him be solemnly admonished, until the Consistory declares, that greater Severity is to be used; and then let the Lord's Supper be denied him, and let him be committed to the Synod. It was also ordered, that the Papacy being publickly disclaimed by Oath, the whole People should swear to the Christian Religion and Doctrine comprehended in a few Chapters. I was consulted about this Question, Whether they that desired Mission into the Church, may be required to give a publick Testimony of their Faith? Which I thus answered; I see no Reason why they, who will be accounted of the Communion of Christ, should think it grievous to give up their Names to Christ their Head; which cannot be done, unless they expressly subscribe to sincere Religion, and ingenuously condemn these Errors by which the Sincerity of Religion is corrupted: We know how much St. *Paul* commends unto us the *Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace.* Moreover, to retain and cherish Agreement among good Men, a solemn Confession of Faith is more than necessary; and whoever wish that the Church of God may stand safe, will not take it amiss to support it by such a Means. And the Wantonness of Men's Understanding, is to be restrained, that they be not too curious in the Desire of Knowledge: A learned Ignorance is to be commended, while we seek Wisdom only in the Word of God; and even there reverently admire those Things which God would have to be kept secret.

Calv: Epist: ad *Protect* Epist: 167. *Beza* in vita *Calvini.* Epist: 827. *Ad verspellem quendam.*

Mr.

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of an Appeal to Calvin's *Tribunal, &c.*

Mr. Calvin's *Answer to Mr.* Cartwright's *Representation of his Opinion of Arch-bishops and Bishops.*

MR. *Cartwright* may not be believed in a Report so contradictory to my publick Writings: I would never have the Authority of the Church Governours denied unto them; but do acknowledge, that the Bishops, which, according to their Office, do teach the Word of God, ought reverently to be heard.

I had always a great Reverence for the Bishops of your Church, to whom I gave inward Reverence as well as outward Respect, and would gladly have served them, in settling of the *English* Church; and my Judgment is, That if we may have such an Hierarchy, in which the Bishops so excel others, that they refuse not Subjection to Christ, but would depend on him as their only Head, and refer themselves to him; in which they so preserve brotherly Communion among themselves, that they are united by nothing more than the Truth: In this Case I denounce him worthy of all Curses who doth not observe such an Hierarchy with all Reverence and Obedience. And I would to God such a Succession had continued to this Day, it should easily have found from us the Obedience that it deserves. I do account the Government by Arch Bishops a moderate Honour, as being within the Compass of a Man's Power to execute, which the Pope's pretended Authority is not; and the ancient Church did appoint *Patriarchs* and *Primates* in every Province, as a Bond to unite Bishops in Concord.

Calv. Confess. Fid. Gall. *Epist. to* Cran. *de Reformand. Eccles. necessitate. Vera ecclesiæ Reformatio Epist. ad regem* Poloniæ.

Calvin's *Opinion concerning distinct Orders in the Ancient Church.*

THere is a threefold Ministry commended unto us in the Scripture, and whatever Ministry was in the primitive Church, was distinguished into three Orders; for from the Order of *Presbyters*, there was chosen *Pastors* and *Doctors*, the rest were to inspect Manners and Censures. The Care of the Poor was committed to the *Deacons*: S. *Hierom* names Five Orders in the Church (*viz.*) *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, the *Fideles*, or faithful, and the *Catechumeni*, (Three of these were of the Clergy, the other Two of the Laity.)

Calv. *Inst. L.* 4. C. 4. *S.* 1.

Calvin's *Opinion of the Order of* Bishop, *as distinct from a* Presbyter, *in the Primitive Church.*

THe Presbyters to whom the Office of preaching was enjoined did in every City chuse one out of their Number, to whom they solely gave the Title of Bishop; lest Dissension should arise, where all were equal (as it usually comes to pass.) Now every City had a College of Presbyters, which were Pastors and Teachers, for they all had the Office of teaching, exhorting and reproving in the Congregation.

To every City a certain Region or Province belonged, which had Presbyters sent from the City, and they were accounted Members of the Body of that Church: This is the Sum then of the primitive Government: Presbyteries consisted of Pastors and Teachers, nor were they seated any where but in Cities, to which the Region (or Dioceses) was adjoined; and to avoid Confusion, over each Presbytery, and the adjoining Country, was a Bishop, who in Dignity and Authority was above them: It was no human Invention but a divine Institution, that every one should have a Church assigned to him, yet so as he might by his Presence and Counsel assist other Churches, thus *Archippus* was Bishop of the *Colossians*: And the Assembly at *Ausburg* declared,

That

Digitized by Google

That the Biſhops might ſtill retain the Obedience due to them, if they urged us not to keep thoſe Traditions, which we could not keep with a good Conſcience; and we often proteſted, that we did greatly approve the Eccleſiaſtical Polity and Degrees in the Church, and as much as lieth in us endeavoured to conſerve the ſame: That we did not miſlike the Authority of *Biſhops*, ſo that they would not compel us to do againſt God's Commandment, and we did there proteſt, and ſo recorded it, that we would willingly preſerve the Eccleſiaſtical and Canonical Polity, if the Biſhops would not tyrannize over our Churches; which Intention of ours, we declared to excuſe us to all Poſterity, that it might not be imputed to us that the Authority of Biſhops was overthrown by us; and I remember what *Melancton* ſaid there particulary; I would to God it lay in me to reſtore the Government of Biſhops, for I ſee that hereafter there will grow up a greater Tyranny in the Church than ever there was before. I was alſo with *Martin Bucer* at the Conference at *Worms*, where we alſo conſented to Epiſcopal Government, and that the Caſe of Ordination of Miniſters ſhould be committed to them, the Reformation being firſt made.

Calv. *L.* 4. *C.* 4. *S.* 2. *L.* 4. *C.* 3. *S.* 7. *Confeſſ. Aug. per Chytriam. pag.* 109. *pag.* 305.

Calvin's *Sentiment about* Hierome's *confounding the Names of Biſhop and Presbyter*, &c.

S. *Hierome* indeed counteth the Biſhops to be of Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, but of ſuch Antiquity, that they muſt be alſo Apoſtolical; for writing to *Evagrius*, he confeſſeth, That at *Alexandria*, from the Time of S. *Mark* to that of *Dionyſius*, the Preſbyters did always chuſe one from their Number, whom they ſet in a higher Degree, and called him Biſhop. And you may ſee in *Euſebius*, the beſt Preſerver of Eccleſiaſtical Antiquities, a Series of the Succeſſion of Biſhops in the Four principal Churches of the World, to wit, *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, *Rome* and *Alexandria*.

Calv. *Inſt. L.* 4. *C.* 4. *S.* 2.

Calvin's *Opinion, whether there were Arch-Biſhops in the Primitive Church, ſuperior to Biſhops.*

FOR the Conſervation of Diſcipline, every Province had an Arch-Biſhop over the Biſhops; and in the *Nicene* Synod we read of Patriarchs above the Arch-Biſhops, that if Matters of Moment were to be determined, they might firſt be diſcours'd of in the Provincial Synod, then by the Patriarch in the Synod; beyond which, was no Appeal but to a General Council.

Calv. *L.* 4. *C.* 4. *S.* 4.

Calvin's *Opinion in the Inſtance of* Diotrephes, *of ambitious Men advancing themſelves above their Brethren, and of changing the Government which the Apoſtles left in the Church.*

IF we ſeriouſly conſider the Subſtance of this Government, omitting the Name (*Hierarchy*) we ſhall find that the ancient Biſhops never intended to deviſe any other Form of Government in the Church differing from that which God had preſcribed in his Word, and although the Biſhops of theſe Times did ſet forth many Canons, wherein they ſeemed to expreſs more than was declared in the Scripture, yet they ſettled the Government with ſo great Caution, according to that only Rule, that you may perceive it to have nothing different from the Word of God; and if any Thing ſeemed defective in that Inſtitution, yet ſeeing they ſincerely endeavoured to preſerve the Inſtitution of God, and did not err much from it; it behoves us to conſider what Obſervation they had. This was the Form of the ancient Church, which preſents to our Eyes a certain Image of Divine Inſtitution.

Calv. *L.* 4. *C.* 4. *S.* 4. *S.* 1.

Cal-

Digitized by Google

Calvin's *Sentiment of the* Biſhops *having the ſole Power of Ordination.*

I Have already told, that Reformation being once made, our learned Men conſented that Biſhops ſhould take the Power of Ordination to themſelves. And I ſuppoſe this is agreeable to the Apoſtolical Practice; for there was at *Epheſus* a College of *Presbyters*, when St. *Paul* ordained *Timothy*; and though the Apoſtle tells us *of the puting on of the Hands of the Presbytery*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. Yet in another Place he mentions the Impoſition of no Hands but his own, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. I do not underſtand the firſt Place to be meant of the College of Presbyters, but of the Ordination it ſelf; as if the Apoſtle had ſaid, ſee that the Grace of God, given thee by the Impoſition of Hands, when I made thee a Presbyter, be not in vain: For tho' the Word Πρεσβυτέριυ may be underſtood collectively, yet all Things conſidered, the other Senſe, which interprets it, as denoting the Office, doth very well agree, for it appears not, whether all did impoſe Hands, or one in the Name of all, to which I moſt incline.

L. Calv. *Proteſt. addit. to Articles.*

Calvin's *Opinion of the Ordination of Presbyters without Biſhops.*

THe Queſtion was propoſed to me in theſe Terms, By whom the Paſtors muſt be ordained to make the Succeſſion lawful? To this I anſwered, Becauſe I perceive it to be of great Conſequence that nothing be done diſorderly in the Church, leſt thereby the Reins be let looſe to the Luſt of every one, and becauſe it is commanded as expreſly by the Spirit of God, in the Words of St. *Paul*, *That all Things be done decently, and in Order*; I judge, that the ordinary Miniſtry ought herein to be reverently obeyed; and it were greatly to be deſired, that a continued Succeſſion might be preſerved, that the Office might be delivered from Hand to Hand. And it is certain, that in a Church rightly conſtituted, none are to be admitted to the publick Office of teaching, but who are called to it by the ordinary Miniſters; and wherever the State of the Church is found, or but in a tolerable Condition, the ordinary Vocation is to be expected. In the Primitive Times, the Biſhop put on a certain Ornament to diſtinguiſh him from the Presbyters, and he alone is ſaid to ordain: Whence the Ancients often ſay, Wherein doth the Biſhop differ from the Presbyter, the Power of Ordination only excepted? Now, at the Conſecration of an Arch-Biſhop, all the Biſhops of the Province were wont to aſſemble together in the chief City, and the Ceremony of his Conſecration, was alſo impoſition of Hands.

Calvin Epiſt. 190. De vera Eccl. Refor. *L.* 4. *C.* 4. *S.* 15.

Calvin's *Opinion of thoſe great Revenues and Dignities, which the Biſhops enjoy.*

LEt us conſider the double Office of ſuch Perſons. Firſt, they are to labour, and then they are alſo to attend to Government. Now ſuch Men are worthy of double Honour, that is, as St. *Chryſoſtom* interprets it, both of Maintenance and Reverence. I do not oppoſe his Senſe, let every one that will be of the ſame Mind. I could not but expreſs my Senſe, in an Epiſtle to Arch-Biſhop *Cranmer*, when I heard that the Revenues of the Church were to be made a Prey; that it would be an evident Hinderance to good preaching, and an intolerable Miſchief. When the People of *Geneva* ſeized on the Church Treaſures (whereof the Biſhop anciently had the Care) I openly profeſſed, that I could by no Means favour ſuch Sacrilege, which I knew would one Day be ſeverely puniſhed by Heaven: But yet I acknowledged the juſt Judgment of God, in permitting that Sacrilege; that the Goods ſo ill gotten by the *Romiſh* Sacrificers, would not be permitted by God to be added to the Treaſury of his Church. It was objected to us of *Geneva*, That we had taken away the Lands of the Church, and converted them to profane Uſes. To which I anſwered, That, if I ſhould ſay we have not offended in this Reſpect, I ſhould lie; nor do I excuſe what is done: For it is Sacrilege; and a grievous Judgment is denounced againſt thoſe that rob the Church, to enrich themſelves: And I do here teſtify, that I will not excuſe all

that

Digitized by Google

that is done among us (though many Miniſters were maintained in thoſe Churches, which were before oppreſſed with Abundance of Wealth, but deſtitute of Paſtors. And the Schools and Hoſpitals did not only remain without Diminution, but received Augmentations, and new Hoſpitals and Schools were founded; where not only the Maſters were provided for, but the Boys alſo were educated, in hope of being ſerviceable to the Church:) For, I profeſs, it diſpleaſeth me, that a greater Care is not taken, that the Revenues of the Church be employed to thoſe Uſes to which they were dedicated; and all good Men do lament the ſame with me. And I expreſſed my Senſe particularly in the Caſe of your Church; that among other Evils I account this to be an incurable One (until the King aſſume his Right of Government) that the Revenues of the Church are devoured by the Nobles, who for a vile Stipend, hire Men of no Worth, to perform the Office, or rather fill up the Place, of a Paſtor; but I will not leave ſharply to reprove them. Mr. *Ramſey*, in a Sermon of Sacrilege, ſays, that Mr. *Calvin* told the Magiſtrates of *Geneva*, that, *They had taken the Purſe from* Judas, and given it to the Devil.

Calv. *in* 1 Theſſ: 5. 12. *Epiſt*: 127. *to Arch-biſhop* Cranmer. Beza *in vita* Calvini, 1545. *De neceſſit; Reform: Eccl; Epiſt*: 123.

Calvin's *Sentiment of the Biſhops impoſing ſo many Things upon the Conſciences, both of the Miniſters, and of the People, as ſtinting the Spirit of God, and ſtifling the Gifts of his Miniſters, by the Impoſition of a Liturgy, which they are bound to uſe always in publick Worſhip.*

WHen the Faithful meet, they are taught to join their Deſires, and to uſe common Prayers, not only to teſtify the Unity of their Faith, but that God may hear what is the Conſent of all: And *John Baptiſt*, as it is probable, did out of certain Places of Scripture, compoſe a Form of Prayer for his Diſciples, ſuitable to that Seaſon, and the Spiritual Kingdom of Chriſt, ſhortly to be revealed. And our Saviour did twice preſcribe that Form of Prayer which he taught his Diſciples; and I think it to be agreeable to the Command of our Lord, that his Saints ſhould daily repeat this Prayer. And, I believe, the Uſe of Liturgies in the Church were very ancient; becauſe it was a Cuſtom among the Primitive Chriſtians, to ſing not only Hymns, but Prayers alſo. And that muſt neceſſarily be done by Form. And certainly, if ſinging be attempered to that Gravity, which may become the Preſence of God, and his holy Angels, it both procures Dignity and Gratefulneſs to ſacred Actions, and alſo availeth very much to excite the Minds of Men to a true Earneſtneſs and Zeal in Prayer; and I greatly commend it, if it be accompanied with the Devotion of the Mind.

I do therefore highly approve, that a certain Form of Prayers and Eccleſiaſtical Rites, be publiſhed; from which it may not be lawful for the Paſtors to vary in their Adminiſtrations; whereby to provide againſt the Simplicity and Inability of ſome; and that the Conſent of all the Churches, with each other, may more certainly appear; and laſtly, to put a Bar to the deſultory Levity of others, who affect Innovations.

I did therefore compoſe certain Forms of Prayer *, to be uſed by the Miniſters in *Geneva* in the publick Worſhip, on Sundays and other holy Days, and at the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments: And when the Exiles that reſided at *Geneva* in the *Marian* Days, could not agree about the Uſe of the *Engliſh* Liturgy, they did, by my Advice and Approbation, draw up a Liturgy for their publick Worſhip, which was printed in the *Engliſh* Tongue, *Anno* 1556; wherein was a Confeſſion taken out of the 9th of *Daniel*, a Prayer for the whole Eſtate of Chriſt's Church, the Lord's Prayer: the Creed, *&c.*

L. 3. C. 20. S. 32. Calv. *in* Matth. 18, 19, 20. Matth. 6. 9. *Inſt.* L. 4. C. 1. S. 23. S. 31. *Epiſt. ad* Protect. *Opuſc.* p. 33. Calvin's *Prayer before his Sermons.* * Det nobis Dominus in Cœleſtis ſuæ ſapientiæ Myſteriis, cum vero pietatis profectu verſari, in gloriam ſuam & ædificationem noſtram. Amen.

An

A Continuation of an Appeal to Calvin's *Tribunal*, &c.

Calvin's *Cenſure of the ancient* Engliſh *Liturgy, to wit, his ſaying, That in it were many tolerable Follies.*

THERE are many unfit Things in it, which yet are tolerable (if it be as you, that is, *Knox*, *Whittingham*, &c. preſent it to me) and I believe, no *Engliſh* Biſhop could give a milder Cenſure of it, if it were preſented to him in the ſame Dreſs. If I had believed them to be real Follies, I would not have judged them tolerable, in the Worſhip of God. But I gave the Protector three Inſtances of ſuch Things; the firſt was, Prayers for the Dead at the Celebration of the holy Communion. 2. Chriſm at Baptiſm. 3. Extreme Unction. But I was alſo informed by Mr. *Knox* and others, That in that Liturgy was preſcribed the Uſe of Wax-Candles, diverſe Croſſings in the Communion Service, where alſo the Prieſt was to put the Sacrament into the People's Mouths, Women admitted to baptize, the Child was to be thrice dipped in the Water, firſt on the Right Side, then on the Left Side, and then the Face towards the Font, and other Trifles; which, as for the Time preſent, I thought tolerable; ſo, I could not do leſs than count them unfit for ſuch a Reformation. And I explained my ſelf in theſe Words *(viz.)* That there was not that Purity that might be wiſhed, but the Imperfections which could not be amended ſo early, might be born with for a Time, there being no manifeſt Impiety in it.

But it is worthy your Conſideration, who were the Authors of your Liturgy, and what Teſtimonies they gave to it. Dr. *Taylor*, a famous Martyr, when it was ſettled by Authority after its Reformation, affirmed, That it was ſo reformed, and fully perfected, according to the Rules of Chriſtian Religion in every Behalf, that no Chriſtian Conſcience could be offended with any Thing therein contained. And Mr. *Fox* ſays, It was generally eſteemed as a Work of God. Doubtleſs thoſe prudent and pious Martyrs, that died in Defence of it, were well ſatisfied of the Legality and Purity thereof, at leaſt, that there was no manifeſt Impiety in it.

Calvin. *Epiſt.* 200. *Epiſt.* 87. *Epiſt.* 206. *Epiſt.* 200. *Acts and Monuments, P.* 1521. *firſt Edition.*

Calvin's *Senſe of that Form of Prayer anciently uſed for the Dead*, We commend unto Thy Mercy, O Lord, all other Thy Servants which are departed hence from us, with the Sign of Faith, and now do reſt in the Sleep of Peace: Grant unto them, we beſeech Thee, Thy Mercy and Everlaſting Peace; and that at the Day of the general Reſurrection, we and all they which be of the Myſtical Body of Thy Son, may altogether be ſet on His Right-Hand, and hear that moſt joyful Voice, Come unto Me, O ye that be bleſſed, *&c.*

I Know, that this (Prayer for the Dead) did not relate to any Approbation of the Popiſh Purgatory; nor am I ignorant, that the ancient Cuſtom of making Mention of the Dead, may be ſhewed, that thereby the Communion of all the Faithful, joined in one Body, might be declared: But this unanſwerable Argument, of the Sacredneſs of the Lord's Supper, doth hinder the mixing of human Additions with it; and when we call on God, we muſt not indulge our own Affections. That Form of Prayer, that God would give a good Reſurrection to the Dead, I would have baniſhed, becauſe it agrees not to the Rule of good Devotion; yet I deny not but it may be lawful to conceive ſuch a Wiſh.

Calvin. ad Protect.

Calvin's

Digitized by Google

Calvin's *Opinion of the conſtant pronouncing of the Abſolution, Morning and Evening.*

THe Keys were given to the Church, for the applying of this Bleſſing to us; for when Chriſt gave the Apoſtles a Command and Power to forgive Sins, He did not intend, that they ſhould abſolve them only that were converted from Impiety to the Faith, but rather, that they ſhould adminiſter this Office to the Faithful: Therefore, in the Communion of the Saints, by the Miniſtry of the Church, our Sins are daily abſolved, when the Biſhop or Presbyter, to whom this Office is committed, do confirm pious Conſciences in the Hope of Pardon and Remiſſion, by Evangelical Promiſes; and that as well publickly as privately, as Neceſſity requires. For although the Sons of God be eminent in Holineſs, yet as long as they live in mortal Bodies, they cannot ſtand before God, without Remiſſion of Sins: And this Office is ſo proper to the Church, that we cannot otherwiſe enjoy this Bleſſing, than by continuing in her Communion; and it is diſpenſed by the *Paſtors* and *Miniſters* of the Church, either in the preaching of the Word, or the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments; every one therefore muſt know it to be his Duty, not to ſeek for Remiſſion of Sins, any other where than where the Lord hath appointed: For ſeeing Remiſſion of Sins and Salvation is no where elſe, though we pretend more than an Angelical Life; yet, if by ſuch Boldneſs we ſeparate from the Church, we are very Devils.

Calv. *Inſt. L.* 4. *C.* 1. *S.* 22. Calv. *ad Anabapt.*

Calvin's *Opinion of the frequent Repetition of the Lord's Prayer in the Liturgy.*

I Cannot doubt of the Uſefulneſs of this, ſeeing our Saviour in his Agony prayed Three Times in the ſame Words, which was no ſuch Battology as he had condemned in the Heathen, but Chriſt taught us by his Example, not to faint in Prayer, if we did not preſently obtain our Deſires. I have ſaid formerly, that by the Command of *Chriſt* the Saints ought to ſay it daily, and I fear they that object againſt the frequent Uſe of it, either already have, or are minded to lay it wholly aſide. But they who deſpiſing the Rule of their Maſter, are fond of their own Prayers, do not only want the Word of God, but as much as in them lyeth are Enemies to it.

Calv. *in* Matth. 26. 44. *Inſtit. L.* 3. *C.* 20. S. 28.

Calvin's *Sentiment of theſe Words in the Rubrick at the End of Publick Baptiſm*, It is certain by the Word of God, that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly ſaved.

I Openly affirm, that in Baptiſm we have to do with God, who doth ratifie by His Grace, that which the Miniſter's Hand doth ſignify; and if (as you grant) Baptiſm doth belong to Infants, it is a Madneſs to underſtand it only of the outward Sign, and not of the ſpiritual Myſtery; for, as by Circumciſion God made Infants Partakers of all ſuch things as were thereby ſealed unto them (for God did not delude his People by an inſignificant Symbol) ſo doth Chriſt by Baptiſm, wherein both Remiſſion of Sins, and Regeneration of the Spirit are offered unto us. Chriſt commands Children to be brought to him; why? becauſe he is the Life, that therefore he may enliven them, he maketh them Partakers of Himſelf. But how are Infants regenerate, that are not capable of knowing Good or Evil? I anſwer the Work of God is not therefore null, becauſe we cannot give a Reaſon of it. Moreover, thoſe Infants which you grant, are to be ſaved (as without doubt ſome of that Age are ſaved) it is evident they muſt be firſt regenerate by our Lord, for being unclean by Nature, they muſt be firſt regenerate before they can enter into the Kingdom of God. And by ſanctifying *John* Baptiſt in the Womb, that is before he was born, God ſhew what He can do on other Infants. Nor can it be any way proved, that Children may not be regenerated by the powerful Operation of God, which thing is as eaſy to be done by Him, as the Manner of

Digitized by Google

of doing it is difficult and incomprehensible to us. I therefore agree to this, that this Sacrament is not an empty Figure, but whatever is figured in Baptism, is indeed performed (*viz.*) the Efficacy of the Spirit to cleanse and regenerate us; for the Instruments of the Holy Ghost are not dead things, but God by Baptism truly effects and performs what he signifieth; it is therefore a sacrilegious Divorce, to separate the Sign from the Promise which God maketh. In the Catechism taught at *Geneva* this Question is proposed, *Do you therefore ascribe no other Virtue to the Water, but that it is only a Figure of Washing.* The Answer is, I so believe it to be a Figure, that the Truth is really annexed to it, for God doth not delude us in his Promises; therefore it is undoubtedly certain, that both Forgiveness of Sins and Newness of Life are offered to us, and received by us in Baptism.

Calv. *Opusc. Instit. L.* 4. *C.* 16. *S.* 5. *De vera Eccl. Reform. Inst. L.* 4. *C.* 4. *S.* 17. *Epist.* 179. *to* Melanch. Calv. *Opusc. de Sacram. Opusc. P.* 30.

Calvin's *Opinion of Confirmation by the Bishop.*

IT was an ancient Custom of Christians, when their Children were grown up to bring them to the Bishop, who, because they could not make Confession of their Faith at their Baptism, were to be then examined by the Bishop, according to that certain and common Form of Catechism, which was then in use; and for the greater Solemnity of this Action, Imposition of Hands was used; and so the Child having made Confession of his Faith, was dismissed with a solemn Benediction. And I do deservedly wish that this Rite were every where restored, whereby Children are offered to God, after the Confession of their Faith, which would be a decent Approbation of the Use of Catechising.

Calvin. *Inst. Lib.* 4. *C.* 19. *S.* 4. *Opusc. De vera Eccl. Reform.*

Calvin's *Opinion of the Custom of having Godfathers*, &c.

I Confess that a Stipulation in Baptism is necessary, for nothing is more preposterous than that those should be ingrafted to Christ's Body, whom we may not hope to be his Disciples; wherefore if none of the Kindred appear, that may give his Faith to the Church, and take Charge of teaching the Child, it is but a Luxorious Action, and the Baptism is defiled. It was therefore my Advice, that the Fathers should be present, together with the Sureties to answer to the Interrogatories, unless any Business did hinder them; and this was our Practice at *Geneva*; and being the Office of Godfather was honourable, it was required that they should be of the same Religion. And when things are thus ordered, as *Beza* told your Archbishop *Grindal*, *Quis damnare ausit?* Who dares to condemn this Practice?

Calv. *Epist.* 285. *to* Knox. *Epist* 302. Beza *Epist.* 8.

Calvin's *Opinion of some Scandals taken at the Administration of the Lord's Supper, as admitting prophane Persons to this distinguishing Ordinance.*

BEcause Pastors cannot always watch so diligently as they ought, and are sometimes more indulgent than they should, or are hindered from exercising that Severity which they would, it happens that Men openly wicked, are not removed from the Society of the Saints: This is a Fault which S. *Paul* reproves in the *Corinthians*. But tho' the Church fail in her Duty, it is not lawful for every private Man to resolve presently upon Separation; I deny not but it is the Duty of a good Man to withdraw from the private Familiarity of the wicked; but it is one Thing to avoid the Company of wicked Men, and another Thing through Hatred of them, to renounce the Communion of the Church, whereas therefore they think it is a sacrilegious Thing, to participate of the Bread of our Lord with wicked Men, they are herein more severe than St. *Paul* was, for when he exhorts to a holy and pure Participation, he requires not that every one should examine his Neighbour, or the whole Congregation, but that every one examine himself. If it were a Sin to communicate with an unworthy Person, he would have required us to beware, lest there were any in the Company by whose Uncleanness we might be defiled, but seeing he requires every Man to examine himself

Digitized by Google

ſelf only, he intimates, that it cannot hurt us, if any unworthy Communicants thruſt themſelves among us; and to this Intent is that which the Apoſtle adds, *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himſelf*; he ſays not to others, but to himſelf, and this is juſtly ſaid, for it ought not to be in the Power of every one, to determine who are to be admitted or rejected: The Cognizance of this belongs to the Church, which cannot be exerciſed but in due Order; it would therefore be very unreaſonable, if a private Chriſtian ſhould be polluted by the Unworthineſs of another, to whom he neither can nor ought deny Admiſſion. Yet farther, tho' there may be ſome Unworthineſs in the Miniſter, nothing of the Efficacy of the Sacrament is loſt to ſuch as are duly qualified for the Reception of it, for the Truth of God is not alter'd by the Improbity of Man; the Sacraments do not depend on the Worthineſs of the Miniſter, much leſs of the Communicants.

If all Things be accurately conſidered, it will appear, that they who have ſo much Leiſure to enquire after others, are too often moſt negligent of themſelves. I knew a Man poſſeſſed with this Error, who was afraid to receive the Lord's Supper with us, becauſe of the Vices of ſome among us: In the mean Time he had in his Family two Servants of a very vitious and debauched Life; which when I underſtood, I cauſed him to be admoniſhed of it (becauſe at that Time he would not hearken to me) that it was worth his Labour to think of purging his own Houſe, which was committed to his Charge, ſeeing he thought himſelf to be defiled with the Vices of them, that no Way belonged to his Inſpection. Hereupon he began to think of his Indiſcretion, and to acknowledge it as a Chaſtiſement ſent from God, whereby He rebuked him for his Pride; and ſo he reconciled himſelf both to the Church and me.

If this Diſcipline (of reſtraining wicked Men) be wanting, I confeſs, the Church is imperfect, and hath its Spots; but yet we may not unchurch it, or withdraw from her Communion, nor is it lawful for any Man to ſeparate from it. Let them that ſlander us as Authors of this Doctrine of Separation, preach it to the *Anabaptiſts*; we own it not; but profeſs, that they do wickedly, who are ſo diſpleaſed with the Faults of Men, as to forſake the Communion of the Church of God. Thoſe that are good (as S. *Auguſtine* ſays) are to be loved, the openly Evil to be avoided, and the reſt to be tolerated. If the Papiſts had a pure Form of Prayer, I would not ſcruple to enter into the Temple with them, as the Diſciples did with the *Jews* at the Hour of Prayer. If it be objected, that we may not join our ſelves with them that do crucify Chriſt. I anſwer, An Action which is in it ſelf pious and holy, cannot be corrupted by the Faults of other Men; as I am wont to ſay. That if all the Angels were preſent at the Maſs, they cannot cleanſe it of its Pollution by their Holineſs; nor can all the Devils cauſe by their Preſence, that the holy Supper being celebrated according to Chriſt's Inſtitution, ſhould loſe any Thing of its Purity.

Calv. *Inſt. L.* 4. *C.* 1. *S.* 15. *Epiſt.* 127. *Sive* Paulus *ſive* Judas *baptizat*, Chriſtus *peccata lavat. Epiſt.* 367. *Contra* Anabapt. Calv. *adverſus* Anabap. *Epiſt.* 265.

Calvin's *Judgment of the private Adminiſtration of the Sacraments.*

WHy the Lord's Supper ſhould not be denied to the Sick, many and great Reaſons prevail with me: Let there be ſome Company of the Kindred, Friends, and Neighbours, that Diſtribution may be made, according to the Command of Chriſt; and then let the Action be performed: with an Explication of the Myſtery, but in nothing different from the common Practice of the Church. For, from the Nature, Uſe, and End of this Myſtery, I do rightly conclude, That they ought not to be deprived of ſo great a Benefit, who either labour under daily Diſeaſes, or are in Danger of their Lives, to deny that to them whereby they may be ſtrengthned for the great Conflict and Temptations that are at Hand, and whereby they may teſtify their pious Agreement with the Church, is a hard Thing and of an evil Example, whether a Perſon be confined to his Bed, or nigh to Death: And tho' this be not practiſed in our Church, yet I acquieſce, becauſe it is not profitable to contend. My Judgment for the Adminiſtration of private Baptiſm, and giving the Lord's Supper to Malefactors, that deſire it, and appear qualified for it, is the ſame.

Calv. *Epiſt.* 321. *Epiſt.* 363. *Epiſt.* 185. *ad* Monsbel.

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of an Appeal to Calvin's *Tribunal*, &c.

Calvin's *Opinion what Power the Churches of God have, to ordain and impose Rites and Ceremonies in His publick Worship.*

GOVERNMENT is necessary in every Society, for the Preservation of Peace and Concord; but especially in the Church of God, and because Men are so different in their Manners, various in their Opinions, and of such Opposition in their Judgments. And no Polity can be firm unless ratified by certain Laws, I am so far from condemning such Laws, that I peremptorly assert, that if these be taken away, the very Nerves of the Church (for so I am wont to call Ecclesiastical Constitutions) are dissolved, and the whole Frame deformed and dissipated. I confess therefore, that every Church hath Power to constitute Laws, for the establishing of common Polity and Government. And this Liberty of making Laws was left to the Church by Christ, who would not particularly prescribe what we ought to follow in outward Discipline and Ceremonies, which he foresaw would depend on the Condition of several Ages, and that one Form would not agree with them all. In this Case therefore we must have Recourse to the general Rules which he gave for Decency and Order, and the Commands of the Church are to be referred to them, and those godly Laws of the Church, wherein Discipline and good Order are contained, are not to be accounted humane Traditions, seeing they are founded in that general Precept, and have an evident Approbation, as if they were spoken by Christ Himself. So S. *Paul* gave *Titus* Authority to do the same that he had done *(i. e.)* to set Church Affairs in Order, and to supply what was wanting.

Calv. *Inst. L. 4. C. 10. S. 27. Epist.* 318. *Confess. Fidei Gal. Opusc.* P. 322. *Inst. L. 4. C. 10. S. 30. 1 Cor.* 14. 40. *Tit.* 1. 5.

Calvin's *Sentiment of that Doctrine, namely,* That nothing is to be admitted or imposed as to the Worship of God, for which we have not an express Command in His Word, *&c.*

I Have said enough to confute these Fancies, shewing that particular Rites, which have respect to the general Rules of Decency and Order, or Peace and Charity, are of more than humane Constitution (as Mr. *Cartwright* doth truly affirm) I do not say, as the Council of *Trent*, That Traditions in general are to be received with like Affection of Piety, as the Books of the Old and New Testament; but I say there are many things not expressed in the Word of God, which are never the less certain. Unwary Christians cannot be seduced by a more specious Pretence, than this of Scripture, which the *Anabaptists* so much urge, but they that insist on this Argument against their Adversaries, should consider whether they can plead it for their own Practices, for so *Tertullian* requires, *Expostulantes scripturæ patrocinium in parte adversa, præjudicant, suæ quoq; parti, patrocinium Scripturæ, adesse debere*; To Men of this Opinion there can be neither Peace of Conscience nor End of Superstition. We are thought to be impertinent in making Disputes about the free Eating of Flesh, Use of Holy Days, of Garments, and such other things, which seem to be frivolous to some Men, but are of greater Moment than is commonly believed; for when Men's Consciences are once got into a Snare, they wander in a tedious and perplexed Labyrinth, from whence it is very difficult to find an Outlet if a Man begin to scruple, whether he may use Linnen Sheets, Handkerchiefs, and Napkins, shortly he will question whether he may use such as are made of Hemp, or coarser Materials, afterward he is perswaded he may live without the use of any. If dainty Meats seem at first unlawful, at length he shall not with Satisfaction, before the Lord, eat ordinary Bread and common Meats, while he considers he may preserve his Body with cheaper Food; if he scruple first to drink pleasant

Wine,

Digitized by Google

Wine, anon he cannot with Peace of Conſcience drink of that which is decayed, and at laſt to taſte of any Water that is cleaner than other; and in the End to account it a Sin to tread on a Straw that lieth croſs in his Way. Now here is no light Queſtion begun; for the Controverſie is, Whether God would have us uſe the one or the other, whoſe Will ought to guide us in all our Counſels and Actions, and whoever are inſnared in ſuch Doubtings, let them turn which Way they will, there are ſtumbling Blocks for their Conſciences in that Way. Now in all ſuch things as are not determined by the Word of God, I am of S. *Auguſtine*'s Opinion, that the Cuſtoms of the People of God and the Conſtitutions of our Anceſtors are to be obſerved as a Law. And thus I would reſolve theſe Scruples, that things which are left indifferent (as to Civil Matters) are left to our own Diſcretion, until the Edicts of Princes do determine them; and tho' the things which they enjoyn are ſharp, and ſuch as ſeem unequal, their Commands ought not to be deſpiſed. So likewiſe the external Rites in the Worſhip of God, are in the Power of the Church; and as the Edification of the Church requires, they may be changed or abrogated, and new ones inſtituted. As in the Lord's Supper, whether the People take the Bread in their Hands or not; whether they divide it among themſelves, or every one eat what is given him; whether the Bread be leavened or unleavened; whether the Wine be mixed with Water or not (if it fall ſhort, and to ſupply the Communicants; ſo there be not an Opinion of the Neceſſity of Mixture) is indifferent, and may be obſerved on the Church's Command.

Calv. *ad Verſipellem quendam Decret.* 1. *S.* 4. *contra Anabapt. De Corona Militis.* See *Biſhop* Sanderſon's *Preface. Inſt. L.* 3. *C.* 19. *S.* 7. *Ad Verſipellem. Inſtit. L.* 4. *C.* 17. *S.* 43. *L.* 4. *C.* 10. *S.* 30. *Epiſt.* 259.

Calvin's *Opinion of impoſing Rites and Ceremonies on Conſciences, and ſo abridge Chriſtian Liberty.*

HUman Laws, whether made by the Magiſtrate or the Church, although they are neceſſary to be obſerved, yet do they not bind the Conſcience by their immediate Authority, but by Vertue of a general Precept, commending to us the Magiſtrates Power: And the Neceſſity of obſerving them, reſpects the general End, *(viz.)* Obedience, Charity, and Unity, and is not grounded on the Nature of the Things commanded; nor can that be done which S. *Paul* requires, 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. unleſs the Decency and Order be eſtabliſhed, by the Addition of certain (Canons or) Obſervations as ſo many Bonds: This only is always to be excepted. Firſt, That the Obſervations be not believed to be neceſſary to Salvation; and ſo be thought religiouſly to bind the Conſcience. Or, ſecondly, That they be not ſo added to the Worſhip of God, as if any Holineſs did conſiſt in them. And thirdly, That they be not held to be perpetual and unalterable, but only as outward Rudiments of human Infirmity; which tho' we donot all want, yet we may all uſe, for the Preſervation of Unity, and yet our Liberty is not loſt. Suppoſe a Man be commanded to abſtain from certain Meats, as 1 *Cor.* 10.28. the Command being concerning things indifferent, with reſpect to Scandal, he loſeth not his Liberty of Conſcience in obeying; for his Conſcience is free in Reſpect of God, and of the Things commanded, which he judgeth ſtill to be indifferent. In ſuch Things therefore it hath been thought fit, that a general Rule ſhould be given for eſtabliſhing of Church Polity, both to the Miniſters and People, from which it ſhould not be lawful for them to recede. Nor is our Liberty hereby infring'd, which we may preſerve, tho' we willingly ſubmit to a certain Neceſſity, either as that *Decorum* (of which we have ſpoken) or the reſpective Charity doth require. So I adviſed *Farel*, that he would not ſuffer pertinacious Controverſies among Neighbours about Ceremonies, ſeeing all Things are ours, we being free from all, are the Servants of Peace and Concord. When for the ſake of publick Decency a Law is made and publiſhed, then is Superſtition taken away; into which they only fall, that meaſure the Worſhip of God by Men's Inventions. Again when ſuch a Law is known to belong to common Uſe, that falſe Opinion of Obligation and Neceſſity is overthrown, which is wont to ſtrike great Terror into the Conſciences, when Men think them neceſſary to Salvation: But here nothing is ſought for, but the Increaſe of Charity, by joining in ſuch common Practices. And S. *Paul*'s Rule for Decency tends to this, That, while Ceremonies are uſed to beget a Reverence towards Things ſacred, we may by thoſe Helps be ſtirred up to Piety. And alſo, that Modeſty and Gravity, which ought to be regarded

Digitized by Google

garded in all honeſt Actions, may moſt appear in thoſe that are ſacred: Of this kind are Kneeling, and uncovering the Head when we pray; and that in the Burial of the Dead we uſe a certain Honour and Decency; which I thus expreſſed, That the Corps be carried to the Church-yard, and that an Exhortation be made, ſo as they which attend the Funeral may underſtand what is ſpoken: That Miniſters be diſtinguiſhed from others by their Garments. And in ſuch Things as are of a middle Nature, (*i.e.*) neither Good nor Evil, we may uſe them or refrain from them, as the Laws of our Superiors for Decency and Charity do require. It is the Duty of Chriſtian People to obſerve ſuch Conſtitutions, with a free Conſcience, without any Superſtition, but with a pious and facile Reſolution to obey; and not by any Contempt or ſupine Negligence to omit them: So far muſt they be from an open Violation of them, through Pride and Contempt; for even in thoſe Things (that are indifferent) the Cuſtoms and Inſtitutions of Religion, and the Rule of Humanity and Modeſty, do dictate what is to be done or forborn; in which if we err by Imprudence or Oblivion, the Fault is not conſiderable; but if by Contempt, it is a Contumacy fit to be condemned. If therefore any ſhall clamour againſt this, and ſeem more wiſe than he ought, let him take heed upon what account he may approve this his Moroſity to the Lord; that of S. *Paul* ſhall ſatisfy us, *We have no ſuch Cuſtom* (of Contending) *nor the Churches of God*, 1 Cor. 11. 16. Contention is a dangerous Thing, and therefore ought to be baniſhed out of the Churches; and perverſe contentious Perſons are rather to be ſuppreſſed by Authority than by long Diſputations; for there will never be an End of Contentions, if you think to overcome a diſputatious Man by Argument: For tho' he be overcome an Hundred times; yet will he not be wearied. Let us therefore diligently obſerve this, That we ſuffer not our ſelves to be carried away with needleſs Diſputations.

Calv. *Inſtit.* *L.* 4. *C.* 10. *S.* 5. *&* 6. *S.* 27. *L.* 4. *C.* 4. *S.* 1. *&* 4. Lex externum opus ligans, conſcientiam liberam relinquit. *L.* 3. C. 19. *Ult. Inſtit.* *L.* 4. C. 10. *S.* 32. *Epiſt. ad* Farellum. Calv. *Inſtit.* *L.* 4. C. 10. *S.* 28. *Epiſt. ad* Monſbelgard. *Comment. in* Zach. Calv *confutatio* Hollandi. *Inſtit.* *L.* 4. C. 10. *S.* 31. *Epiſt.* *Col.* 313. *in Fol.*

Calvin's *Opinion of ſuch as account thoſe who preach this Doctrine, Perſecutors.*

AS to the Charge of Perſecution, I affirm, That when any wicked or pernicious Sect begins to ariſe, eſpecially when it increaſeth, it is the Duty of ſuch as God hath appointed for the Edification of His Church, to countermine them and withſtand them ſtoutly, before they get Strength to bring all to Confuſion: For ſeeing they are made the Paſtors of the Church, they ought not only to feed the Flock of God with wholſome Food, but alſo diligently to watch againſt Wolves and Thieves, that when ſuch come nigh the Flock, they may remove them as far as they can, by great Clamours, for they are worſe than Wolves or Thieves. And when once the Concord of the Church is violated, there is no End nor Meaſure in Contention. And how ſtrict our Diſcipline at *Geneva* is in this Reſpect, is well known to all the Reformed Churches.

It is a moſt juſt Thing to ſubmit to the Yoke of Chriſt (*ſo he calls Church Diſcipline*) and to acknowledge this; That the lawful Uſe of our Chriſtian Liberty is to be far from unbridled Licence.

Calv. *contra Anabapt.* Nulla obligatione ſine coertione. *Epiſt. fol. col.* 322.

Calvin's *Opinion of Ceremonies, which are ſignificant of the Myſteries and Doctrines of Faith.*

I Say, That Ceremonies ought to be accommodated to the Uſe and Capacity of People, for the End of Decency is, That when ſuch Rites are uſed, which may procure Veneration to Holy Things, we may by ſuch Helps be ſtirred up to Piety; as alſo, that Modeſty and Gravity which ought to appear in all honeſt Actions, may ſhine, eſpecially in ſacred Things. That therefore is Decency, which adds an Ornament agreeable to the Action: And this is not without Profit; for by it, the Faithful are admoniſhed, with how great Modeſty, Religion and Obſervation, Holy Things ought to be handled. And leſt any ſhould ſlander me, as being too Moroſe and Rigid, as if I did preciſely take away all Liberty, I do hereby teſtify to all pious Men, that I contend not about Ceremonies, which ſerve only for Decency and Order, or which are (*Symbols*) Significations, and Incitements of that Reverence which we offer to God; let no Man ſay therefore that I allow no Ceremony, to aſſiſt the Ignorance of the ruder Sort, for

Digitized by Google

I think such Helps to be very profitable; I only would have such a Moderation, that Christ may be illustrated and not obscured. And these Restrictions are necessary to be observed, that the Ceremonies be few in Number, facile in Observation, and that there be a Suitableness of Dignity in the Signification; otherwise Things indifferent may change their Nature. Nor may we, as the Papists do, *teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*, who make their Religion a barbarous Empire, teaching that their Ceremonies are a Part of God's Worship, imposing them on the Consciences of the People, as Things of Necessity, accounting them meritorious Services. We have in the Papacy more than enough, and such as are unapt for Signification: Whereas Ceremonies ought to be squared to the Edification and Unity of the Church. I do indeed condemn such Ceremonies as are added to the Sacraments, to be mystical Significations of them, but not as they are significant of moral Duties; but in those Sacramental Duties, to which God hath annexed a Promise of Grace, I allow them not. Our Ceremonies then, may not be like those of the Papists, unintelligible like Magical Incantations; for all Ceremonies are corrupt, which do not lead Men unto Christ.

Calv. *Epist.* 85. *de vera Eccles. Reform. L.* 4. *C.* 10. *S.* 14. *Thes. Eccles. Belg. L.* 4. C. 10. *S.* 1. *Opusc.* 125. Calv. *in Levit.* 4. 22. *L.* 4. C. 10. *S.* 15.

Calvin's *Judgment of such Ceremonies as have been used to Idolatry in the Church of* Rome.

LET not any think me so austere, or strait-laced, as to forbid a Christian, without any Exemption, to accommodate himself to the Papists in any Ceremony or Observance; for it is not my Purpose to condemn any Thing, but what is clearly evil and openly vitious. The ancient Rites whose Footsteps and Lineaments do yet appear, although they decline in some respect from their End and Use; yet for the sake of Peace and publick Utility, may be observed, until by publick Authority they may be restored to their proper End, or be quite taken away: And therefore I do not contend for the casting out any Thing, but what is filthily corrupted with the manifest Spot of Impiety. I know that the Jews, during the Time of their Pedagogy, were commanded to destroy the Groves and Altars of Idolaters, not by virtue of the Moral Law, but by an Appendage in the Judicial or Politick Law, which obliged that People only for a Time, but it binds not Christians: And therefore we do not scruple at all, whether we may lawfully use these Temples, Fonts, and other Materials, which have been formerly abused to idolatrous and superstitious Uses. I confess indeed, we ought to remove such Things as seem to nourish Idolatry; provided that we our selves, in opposing too violently Things which are in their own Nature indifferent, be not too superstitious. It is equally superstitious to Condemn Things indifferent as Unholy, and to Command them as if they were Holy. *Quod rectum habeant Gentiles non improbarunt sancti Patres.*

Calv. *de Vitand. Superst.* Retinenda pura Institutio, Superstitio corrigenda. Calv. *in Heb.* 6. 1. Calv. *ad quendam Verspellem. Ibidem.* Calv. *on the second Command.* Quale hoc est, ut quia *Novatianus* hoc facere audet nos putamus non esse faciendum. *S.* Cyprian. *Epist.* 37.

A Con-

A Continuation of an Appeal to Calvin's *Tribunal*, &c.

Calvin's *Opinion, whether Superſtition doth conſiſt in charging upon our Conſciences the Forbearance and Diſuſe of Things indifferent, as well as the Uſe of them.*

MEN are too rigorouſly ſuperſtitious in oppoſing Things indifferent: S. *Paul* condemns ſuch as did entangle the Conſciences of the People with their Prohibitions: *Eat not, taſte not, touch not* (for ſo I ſuppoſe the Word ἅπτου is to be rendred, the Verb ἅπτεσθαι ſignifying to Eat as well as to Touch) for theſe falſe Teachers begun to forbid firſt what ſeemed moſt offenſive, that is, To eat and feaſt upon Idolatrous Meats; then having obtain'd this, they forbade them to Taſte, tho' they Eat nothing; then they make it a Sin to touch with their Fingers any Thing that they had prohibited; and ſo there is no End, when this Tyranny is once begun; new Prohibitions are ſtill making, as I have given Inſtance in the Church of *Rome*. Of this Humour I found Mr. *Knox* and ſome others to be guilty, forbidding their Party to join with their *Engliſh* Brethren, becauſe of ſome Ceremonies, which, as he informed me, had occaſioned new Troubles. I knew the Cauſe of thoſe Troubles, and applied this Cure; I hope, Mr. *Knox*, your Rigour in (oppoſing not impoſing) Ceremonies, tho' it have provoked many, will yet be moderate. We muſt indeed labour to purge the Church of Error and Superſtition; yet with this Limitation, which you well know, that ſome things, tho' they be not well approv'd, may yet be born with. And when ſome complained to me of the Troubles they met with, for refuſing of Ceremonies, I told them it was my Judgment that but a few Ceremonies ſhould be uſed in the Church; but it altered the Caſe, where they had no Power to admit or reject what they pleaſed; and therefore they ought not, becauſe of them, to interdict themſelves from the Lord's Supper; if we may not obtain what we deſire, let us bear with thoſe Defects which we approve not of; ſo long as there is no Impiety or Repugnancy to the Word of God. The ſame was my Advice to the Church at *Monsbelgard*, who complained that their Prince did impoſe certain Rites, not formerly uſed in their Church. I charged them not to be too moroſe, in what they might lawfully diſpenſe with, and tho' ſome might be offended at thoſe Rites, the Fear of that ſhould not hinder from admitting them, when the Prince enjoined them. I alſo gave this Advice to one that lived among the Papiſts, touching Ceremonies not branded with any Impiety, to uſe them ſparingly and ſoberly, but when Occaſion ſhewed, freely and ſecurely, ſo as it may eaſily appear that he was not ſuperſtitious, either in affecting or refuſing them. In a Word, there may be need of correcting ſome Ceremonies, but there is as great Danger from ſharp Remedies as from the Diſeaſe; that Severity which proſecutes every Fault to the utmoſt, and doth not moderate the Method of Healing, is very deſtructive. *Peccat qui damnat quaſi peccata quæ nulla ſunt.* S. *Aug.* De Libero Arbitrio.

Calvin. *in Exod.* & 206 *Epiſt.* Calv. *in Col.* 2. 20. *Epiſt.* 105. *See alſo Epiſt.* 206. *Epiſt.* 303. *Epiſt.* 51. Calvin. *de illicitis ſacris Opuſc.* 664. Calvin. *ad quendam Verſipellem.*

Calvin's *Judgment wherein the Viciouſneſs of the* Romiſh *Ceremonies doth conſiſt, and how they differ from ſuch as may be lawfully uſed.*

THE Difference appears in many conſiderable Circumſtances; for *Firſt*, The barbarous Empire hath ſo increaſs'd the Number of them, that the Condition of the *Jews* was more tolerable, *and they teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*, that is, they make their Ceremonies a conſiderable Part of God's Worſhip, impoſing them on the Conſciences of the People as neceſſary to Salvation, and teaching that they are meritorious Services, and ſuch Sacrifices as do expiate Sin: They make it as great a Sin to eat Fleſh on a *Friday* as to commit Fornication; and condemn the Marriage of a Prieſt as much as Adultery; and many ſuch Abominations which you may read in that Chapter.

Calvin. *Inſt. L.* 4. *C.* 10. *S.* 1. Per crucis hoc ſignum depellitur omne malignum.

Cal_

Digitized by Google

Calvin's *Opinion, Whether thoſe who ſeparate from the Church of* England, *and make new Meetings and Modes of Worſhip, are guilty of Schiſm or no?*

I Judge them to be Schiſmaticks that raiſe Tumults and Diviſions, to diſſipate the Unity of the Church, which cannot otherwiſe be maintained, but by Submiſſion to their Paſtors; and whoever wilfully divide themſelves from the Congregation of the Faithful, the ſame caſt themſelves out of the Kingdom of God. And S. *Paul* condemns them for contentious Men, that pluck up good and profitable Rites without any Neceſſity, and move Controverſies about things not doubtful, who will not be ſatisfied by Reaſon, nor keep themſelves in good Order; there are ſtill in *England* two Sorts of ſeditious Perſons, the one under Pretence of the Goſpel, would bring in Diſorder; the other are hardened in Antichriſtian Superſtitions; both theſe deſerve to be reſtrained by the vindictive Sword.

They therefore are wicked Children (as S. *Auguſtine* alſo ſaith) who not ſo much through Hatred of other Men's Iniquities, as in Affectation to their own Contentions, having inſnared the weaker People by the Greatneſs of their Names, do affect to draw them all after themſelves; or at leaſt to divide them, being ſwoln with Pride, and mad through Perverſeneſs, treacherous in their Calumnies, troubleſome by Seditions, who leſt it ſhould be manifeſted that they want the Light of Truth, pretend the Shadow of rigid Severity, to countenance the Sacrilege of their Schiſm, and the Occaſion of Separation. And thoſe Things which are commanded in the Holy Scriptures to be uſed with great Moderation and Circumſpection, for the correcting of the Faults of their Brethren, they do employ as the Occaſions of a Sacrilegious Schiſm and Separation. But they who are more audacious than others, and the Ringleaders to Separation from the Church, have no other Reaſon for it, but that by a Contempt of all, they may proclaim themſelves to be better than others. (This in the Margent is called the Picture of a Schiſmatick.)

Calvin. *Confeſſ. Fidei.* Calvin. *in* 1 *Cor.* 11. 40. *Epiſt. ad Protect.* Calvin. *Inſtitut. L.* 4. *C.* 1. *S.* 16.

Calvin's *Opinion concerning the Sign of the Croſs, and thoſe other few Ceremonies, retained and now uſed in the Church of* England.

I Am ſo well ſatisfied in the Reaſon and Manner of impoſing thoſe Ceremonies, from what you have told me out of the Preface to the Common-Prayer Book, that my Judgment in this Caſe is the ſame, which I gave concerning the Church of *Frankfort (viz.)* That in middle Things (as thoſe Rites are) I yield my ſelf eaſy and flexible; and I was diſpleaſed with them, who as being in the midſt of Eaſe and Delights, were buſy only in raiſing Controverſies concerning the Form of Prayer and Ceremonies, which hindred them from uniting into one Body; whom I deſired not to be ſo rigid, becauſe where there is ſound and wholeſome Doctrine, and Ceremonies are uſed only for Decency, ſuch Things are to be paſt by in Silence, rather than by Occaſion of them to run into Diſſention and Tumults. Firſt therefore, as to the Surplice, I did commend the Conſtancy of Biſhop *Hooper*, in refuſing Unction, but I would not that he ſhould have contended ſo far, about the Cap and Surplice, as to ſuffer Impriſonment for them; and this Advice I gave him. I heard of Biſhop *Latimer*'s Speech, who ſaid, *He would rather preach in a Fool's Coat, than be deprived of his Miniſtry:* But when the Church commands ſuch Things only as ſerve for Decency, and declares that ſhe doth not attribute any Holineſs or ſpecial Worthineſs to them, ſhe ought to be obeyed: And that we ſhould be eſteemed ſuch refractory and tumultuary Men, as had rather ſet the World on Fire, than condeſcend to Moderation, is a bitter and hard Imputation. *Thuanus* ſpeaking of the Cautions and Reſtrictions laid on the Croſs by the Church of *England*, ſays, that it did rather aboliſh than confirm it.

Epiſt. 100. *Epiſt.* 120. *Canon.* 75. *Epiſt.* 117. *Anno* 1603.

Calvin's *Opinion of the Ceremony of Kneeling at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as it is explained and declared by the Church of* England.

THis diſcreet and moderate Declaration of the Church is very ſatisfactory, and I wiſh Miniſters and Brethren were adviſed in my Name, to read and conſider them, which I fear they have not done as they ought. If any Man compare theſe with my Writings, they will find no Difference between them: For I have ſhewed that

Digitized by Google

that (that is, Decency) which is agreeable to the Reverence of holy Myſteries, and is alſo apt to exerciſe us towards Piety, or is at leaſt an Ornament agreeable to the Action, and is not without Fruit, but may mind the Faithful with how much Modeſty, Religion and Obſervance they ought to handle Divine Things (and ſuch is, that we pray on our Knees, bare-headed; that we adminiſter the Sacraments of our Lord not ſordidly, but with a Dignity.) And kneeling and uncovering the Head in Prayer, are Exerciſes whereby we endeavour to ariſe to a greater Veneration of God; and I proved that Kneeling in the time of ſolemn Prayer (and ſuch is that of the Miniſter when he delivers the Sacrament, ſaying, *The Body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which was given for thee, preſerve thy Body and Soul to everlaſting Life*) is of Divine as well as Human Conſtitution: It is Divine as it is a Part of that Decency, the Care whereof is commended to us by the Apoſtle; and Human, as it is eſpecially directed to that End to which it was more generally intended. And how can any Man doubt, that when I conſented to the Uſe of Wafer-Cakes, inſtead of the common Bread, which was formerly uſed, I ſhould oppoſe this Ceremony of Kneeling, that is not half ſo ſubject to Exception or Scandal? For as ſome may be offended at them who kneel, ſo others are offended at them that kneel not; as the Reformed Churches in *Poland*, who look on them as Enemies to the Deity of Chriſt, who will not give him this Reverence. And I pray obſerve what I adjudged concerning the Papiſts worſhipping the Hoſt in the Maſs: That if this were done in the Lord's Supper, I ſhould approve that Adoration to be lawful, which terminates not, nor reſides in the Sign, but is directed to Chriſt ſitting in Heaven.

The Sacrament is the Lord's Teſtimony of his Grace confirmed to us by the outward Sign, with a mutual Teſtification of our Piety towards him: — Therefore it may be lawful to teſtify that Piety, by the Ceremony of Kneeling. There were Two Ceremonies uſed in the Church at Prayer, *viz.* ſtanding, which was long practiſed by the primitive Church, and kneeling. Sitting at the Sacrament was not uſed in any of the reformed Churches, ſave in *Scotland*, and ſome Parts of *Holland*: The *Gallo-Belgicks* uſed ſtanding, and the reformed Churches of *Poland* were deſervedly ſcandalized at ſome among them that contended for it; againſt whom they thus declare, We permit that the Godly do receive the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, ſtanding or kneeling; but foraſmuchas they among us were the firſt Authors of ſitting at the Table of our Lord (contrary to the accuſtomed Rites in all the Evangelical Churches throughout *Europe*) who, unadviſedly changing all Things in the Church, and ſeeming to imitate Chriſt, but without Knowledge, were perfidious Apoſtates from us unto Arrianiſm: We therefore leave this diſhonourable and irreligious Ceremony (which is alſo highly ſcandalous to the Meaner Sort) as proper to them. And another Synod thus declares, This Ceremony (of ſitting) although it be free with the reſt, is not uſed in Chriſtian Churches and Evangelical Congregations, and peculiar only to the unbelieving *Arrians*, who place themſelves in an equal Rank with Chriſt. And they who make it (as many do) a Sacramental Sign, and ſo to be neceſſary to the due Celebration of that Ordinance (that it better expreſſeth the Myſtery of Chriſt's Supper than any other: that by it our Reſt from legal Ceremonies is denoted; and that we are admitted as Coheirs with Chriſt) are guilty of more groſs Superſtition, in impoſing this one, than the Church of *England* is, in enjoining all thoſe other Ceremonies which have been mentioned. And this I obſerve, that they who in the firſt place deny, that God may be worſhipped by external Rites, ſay in the next place, that he cannot be offended; and ſo bring in all manner of Confuſion: Whereas *S. Cyprian* ſays, we muſt pleaſe God both in the Habit of the Body, and the Meaſure of the Voice. *De oratione Domini.*

Inſtit. L. 4. C. 10. *S.* 28, 29. *Inſtit. L.* 4. *C.* 10. *S.* 30. Adoramus in Euchariſtiâ non Euchariſtiam: nos crucem neque adoramus neque optamus. *Min. Felix. Inſt. L.* 4. *C.* 17. *S.* 37. *Inſtit. L.* 4. *C.* 14. *S.* 1. *Synodus Generalis Petrocenſis, Art.* 4. *Synodus Ulodiſlavienſis, Can.* 6. Calvin. *ad* Hollandum. *p.* 570.

Calvin's *Opinion concerning what the Church pleads in her own Juſtification, in not condeſcending to the Alteration of ſome few Words and Phraſes in their Liturgy, which were excepted againſt.*

I Will agree with this Remonſtrance, in an hiſtorical Paſſage concerning my own Practice. In the publick Prayers of the *French* Church, were theſe Words occaſionally inſerted, *viz.* That the New Teſtament is far better than the Old: This Expreſſion a Friend of mine did not like, and ſuppoſed that the Scripture was on his Side;

Digitized by Google

Side; becauſe the Fathers under the Law, and we, are all ſaved by *Chriſt*: But he firſt publiſhed, that the Word (better) ought to be altered, for the Word (ſame) or the whole Sentence rendred thus, The Old and New Covenant were the ſame: But becauſe he unadviſedly ſpread this his Opinion, not acquainting me with it, he was ſharply cenſured and convicted of Levity and Inconſtancy, and would have been more ſeverely handled, but that upon his Submiſſion, I entreated the Senate in his Behalf.

Calv. *Reſp. ad Weſtphalum.*

Calvin's *Opinion, whether the Obſervation of Holy-days, in Memory of the Saints, do not give juſt Cauſe of Offence?*

I Would not have Diſputes raiſed about every Feſtival, but ſuch only as do not promote Edification (as thoſe in the Papacy of the Conception and Aſſumption of the Virgin *Mary*, the one being grounded on a falſe Doctrine, *viz.* that ſhe was conceived without original Sin, the other on a fabulous Opinion) and do at the firſt Appearance tend to Superſtition. Upon my Return to *Geneva*, I found there were no Holy-Days, but the *Sundays*: Thoſe which were obſerved by you were taken away by the ſame popular Decree, wherewith I and *Farel* were baniſhed, which was rather extorted tumultuouſly by the Violence of wicked Men, than decreed by any lawful Order, many of your City were much offended at it, and many Reports were raiſed by malicious and ignorant Perſons, as if I had been the Author of their Abrogation; but I can ſacredly teſtify of my ſelf, that this was done without my Knowledge or Deſire: And I found out this Expedient, that the *Nativity* of *Chriſt* ſhould be obſerved after your Manner; and on other Holy-Days, extraordinary Supplications ſhould be uſed, the Shops being ſhut in the Forenoon, & after Dinner every one ſhould depart to his Calling & other Affairs: But there were refractory Perſons, who by a prepoſterous Malice would differ from the received Cuſtom. And for as much as Variety in an eſtabliſhed Church is not tolerable, and it was apt to breed a Suſpicion in Strangers, that the Citizens were not well agreed among themſelves, I intreated the Senate to prevent this Evil by ſome convenient Remedy. I gave them particular Commendation for their Moderation in their Actings: Yet, in a ſhort Time, I heard the unexpected News of the Abrogation of thoſe Days (and I wiſh that *N.* had not behaved himſelf ſo ambitiouſly) which were not more to be obſerved in this whole Province. The reſtoring of theſe Four Days obſerved by the Church of *England* (the *Nativity*, *Circumciſion*, *Aſcenſion*, *and ſending of the Holy Ghoſt*) he contended againſt with ſo much wilfulneſs, againſt all the Miniſters of the *French* Church, as if the Diſpute had been for the Safety of the whole Church. You would have thought Pope *Victor* had been diſputing againſt the Eaſtern Church about the Obſervation of *Eaſter*, yet when one asked him by what Right the Circumciſion ſhould have more Honour than the Paſſion of Chriſt? he had nothing to reply. This I deſire may be teſtified on my behalf, that if I could have had my Deſire I ſhould never have determined that, which is now conſtituted, and ſo I declared elſewhere that many Defects may be tolerated, which we have not Power to amend; and therefore I think it not fit, that any of my Brethren do ſo urge againſt theſe things as to forſake the Communion of the Church in which he lives, eſpecially when the greater Part of the Flock incline to the contrary Opinion; for though that which is impoſed upon us may bring Scandal, and draw on (*malam caudam*) ill Conſequences, yet becauſe of it ſelf, it is not contrary to the Word of God, it may be yielded to; if there be a Fault in what was done at *Geneva*, it is very unjuſt to impute it to me, ſeeing others did it without my Approbation. I ſhall tell you a Story for the Concluſion of this Anſwer, I had preached once upon *Chriſtmaſs*-Day, and being wearied with that, and viſiting ſome Soldiers, I returned home, and found there a *Pedomontane*, who had fancied a great Opinion of himſelf, pretending that the Lord had appeared to him, and told him that he muſt be *Moſes* and I *Aaron*, he was ſo buſy with me that I could not be permitted to eat one Morſel of Bread; for he was commanded (he ſaid) that being faſting he ſhould relate his Revelation to me faſting: At laſt I got Time to eat a little, but he aſſaulted me again, until his Brethren (being told of his Phrenſie) repudiated him. This Man was prompted by Satan to obſcure the Power of God, manifeſted in the Redemption of that People, with frivolous Allegories to make a meer Fable of it. But there is no Reaſon why Men ſhould be ſo exaſperated at our Eaſe of Liberty, more than we are offended with them in the Uſe of theirs.

Calvin. *Epiſt.* 51. *Epiſt.* 118. *He calls* Sundays Feriæ. *Epiſt.* 379. *Read Epiſt.* 128. *Epiſt.* 119. *Epiſt. ad* Hallerum.

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of an Appeal to Calvin's *Tribunal, &c.*

Calvin's *Opinion of Such as pretend to be great Inſtruments of edifying the Church of God, and to have extraordinary Gifts of God's Spirit in Preaching and Praying.*

THERE were a Sort of Preachers in my Days, that had the Word of Edification perpetually in their Mouths, and they did ſo pleaſe themſelves, that they thought the Art of Edifying was known to none beſide themſelves; but they did rather edify their own Houſes than the Church of God, and made Chriſt a Caterer to furniſh their Kitchen: Many ſuch were among the Anabaptiſts, who uſed a ſtrange and obſcure Speech, prating ſo about Spiritual Things, that they could not be underſtood; all their Talk was of the Spirit, but in ſuch a Language as would amaze ſome Men at their firſt Hearing.

And as for their Pretences to the Inſpirations and Impulſes of the Spirit of God, which the People ſo believe, that they often leave the plain Truths and Precepts of the Word to follow ſuch Pretenders, my Judgment is, That

They who forſaking the Scriptures do imagine, I know not what Way of Communion with God, may be thought poſſeſſed, not ſo much with Error as with Madneſs. There are riſen up a Sort of Brainſick Perſons, that proudly pretending the Teaching of the Spirit, neglect to read them, and eſteem them as a dead Letter; which Neglect is very ridiculous, for they will all grant, That the Apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians had the Spirit of Chriſt, and yet neglected not the Word. S. *Paul*, that was rapt into the Third Heavens, did not ceaſe to make Proficiency in the Law and Prophets; and enjoineth *Timothy* to attend to Reading. If the Spirit which they boaſt of be the ſame, that Spirit was promiſed not to produce new and unheard of Revelations, or to coin new Doctrines to ſeduce us from the Goſpel, but to imprint on our Minds the Doctrine of the Goſpel. But they ſay, It is unworthy of the Holy Spirit, to whom all Things are ſubject, to be in Subjection to the Word. As if it were an ignominious Thing to be unchangeable, always conſtant to it ſelf. Should the Spirit of God be reduced to any Human or Angelical Rule, this were to debaſe it, and bring it into Servitude; but while it is compared and conſidered only by it ſelf, no Injury is offered to it. And leſt the Spirit of Satan ſhould deceive us under this Pretence, he hath given us his Image in the Scriptures, by which we may know Him; ſuch as he did once diſcover himſelf to be there, ſuch he will ever remain. The Apoſtle makes the deſpiſing of the Word to be a Means of quenching the Spirit: What ſay the *Enthuſiaſts* to this? Who cannot but perceive, that the Word is the Inſtrument by which the Spirit diſpenſeth His Illumination to the Faithful, who know no other Spirit than that which ſpake by the Apoſtles, by whoſe Oracles we are required conſtantly to attend to the Hearing of the Word.

The ſame may be applied to thoſe that neglect the Lord's Prayer, and other wholeſome Forms conſonant to the Word, to advance their own Conceptions, under Pretence of immediate Inſpirations of the Spirit. Now as to the Abilities of Miniſters,

I ſhall not enquire into them, they are beſt known to their Superiors; but I would have them to know, that this hath been the conſtant Practice of the Church, which was decreed in the Ancient Synods, That he that would not ſubmit himſelf to the Laws of the common Diſcipline, ſhould be deprived of his Office: And let them not ask by what Authority, ſeeing the Holy Ghoſt hath pronounced concerning ſuch, that the Church hath no Cuſtom of Contending; they may therefore give them a Farewell, that deſpiſe the Laws of common Society: Tell them that God is not the Author of Sedition but of Peace, 1 *Cor.* 14. 33. And remember me to them in this Sentence

Digitized by Google

tence of S. *Auguſtine*, When Schiſm is wilful, and maintained with Obſtinacy, neither Murther nor Adultery is more hateful.

Calv. *ad* Pſendo-Nicodemitas. Calv. *adverſus Anabapt.* Calv. *Inſt.* L. 1. C. 9. *per totum*, *Epiſt.* 397. *contra* Donat. L. 2. C. 6.

Calvin's *Indication on what Scripture the forementioned Practice is grounded, and of what Efficacy it is?*

YOu may ſee both in theſe Two Scriptures, the one in the Old, the other in the New Teſtament. *Deut.* 17. 12. *The Man that will do preſumptuouſly, and will not hearken unto the Prieſt that ſtandeth to miniſter before the Lord thy God, or unto the Judge, even that Man ſhall die.* And our Saviour hath put his Seal to the Church's Cenſures, when he ſays. *Matth.* 18. 18. *Verily I ſay unto you, whatſoever ye ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven.* I adviſe you therefore to conſider thoſe dreadful Curſes which your Mother the Church denounceth to be the Deſert of Rebellious Children, which you may find among her Canons.

The Canons ſay, That, whoſoever ſhall affirm that the Church of *England*, by Law eſtabliſhed under the King's Majeſty, is not a true and Apoſtolical Church, teaching the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, let him be excommunicated, *ipſo facto*.

Whoſoever ſhall affirm, that the Form of God's Worſhip in the Church of *England* eſtabliſhed by Law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer and Adminiſtration of Sacraments, is a corrupt, ſuperſtitious, or unlawful Worſhip of God, or containeth any thing in it repugnant to the Scriptures, let him be excommunicated, *ipſo facto*.

Whoſoever ſhall affirm, That any of the XXXIX. Articles, agreed upon by the Arch-Biſhops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy in the Convocation. *An.* 1562. for the avoiding of Diverſities of Opinions, and for the eſtabliſhing of Conſent touching true Religion, are in any Part ſuperſtitious or erroneous, or ſuch as with a good Conſcience he may not ſubſcribe unto, let him be excommunicated, *ipſo facto*.

Whoever ſhall affirm, That the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of *England* by Law eſtabliſhed, are wicked, Antichriſtian, or ſuperſtitious, or ſuch as being commanded by lawful Authority, Men who are zealouſly and godlily affected, may not with a good Conſcience approve them, uſe them, or as Occaſion requireth, ſubſcribe unto them, let him be excommunicated, *ipſo facto*.

Whoſoever ſhall ſeparate themſelves from the Communion of Saints, as it is approved by the Apoſtles Rules in the Church of *England*, and combine themſelves in a new Brotherhood, accounting the Chriſtians who are conformable to the Doctrine, Government, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of *England* to be Profane, and unmeet for them to join with in Chriſtian Profeſſion, let them be Excommunicated, *ipſo facto*. And the Law of God ſays. *Deut.* 27. 16. *Curſed be he that ſetteth light by his Father or Mother.*

And ſo ſay I---- Now that the Keys were given only to the Apoſtles, ſo that none but their Succeſſors did uſe them, may appear by the Primitive Practice. S. *Cyprian*, recording by whom this Diſcipline was exerciſed, mentioneth the Biſhop and his Clergy, that is, the Presbytery his Aſſeſſors. And S. *Ambroſe* ſays, That in his Age only the Clergy had Cognizance of Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes. And the Effect of it was not for the perpetual Ruin and Deſpair of the Offender, but to condemn his wicked Life and Manners, and to admoniſh him, That unleſs he repented he ſhould periſh. And leſt any ſhould contemn the Judgment of the Church, God Himſelf teſtifieth, that that Sentence is nothing elſe but the Declaration of His own Law, and that he will confirm in Heaven what they decree on Earth; and they cannot err nor diſſent from the Word of God, becauſe they judge by no other Rule but His Word. However, I never thought it profitable to commit this Power to ſingle Paſtors, for it is a thing that begets Hatred, and there is no probable Example of it, and there is an eaſy Lapſe into Tyranny. But the Church cannot be ſafe without it; he therefore that being admoniſhed deſpiſeth the moderate Uſe of it, bewrayeth himſelf to be none of Chriſt's Flock.

And this Diſcipline was ſeverely practiſed in the *Jewiſh* Church under the Law, by God's own Command, *Deut.* 17. 12. *The Man that will do preſumptuouſly, and will not hearken*

Digitized by Google

hearken unto the Prieſt that ſtandeth there to miniſter unto the Lord thy God, or unto the Judge, even that Man ſhall die. (*Ainſworth* ſays, It is to be underſtood eſpecially of the Rebellious Elder, that doth this preſumptuous Act, or teacheth others to do it.)

Printed 1603. Canon 3. Canon 4. Canon 5. Canon 6. Canon 9. Calvin. Inſtit. L. 4. C. 11. S. 6. Plebs eſt Teſtis & Cuſtos. Epiſt. Gaſparo Lyſero. Epiſt. 370.

Thomas Long *concludes with* Calvin's *Epiſtle* ad N. N. *and a Part of* Beza's *Twelfth Epiſtle, thus.*

IF theſe Arguments do not ſatisfy my Brethren, who being carried on with Zeal, are too much addicted to their own Opinions; I beſeech them, for the Lord's Sake, that they would conſider again and again, into what Danger they bring the Church, (you have a Toleration for the preſent) and when it ſhall be noted how refractory you are in many things, will not your Rigidneſs beget in thoſe good and pious Senators, who have granted you this Indulgence, a certain Diſdain and Alienation of Affection. I beſeech them alſo to conſider my Advice to the Duke of *Somerſet*, That it cannot be otherwiſe, but the Papiſts will grow more inſolently proud, unleſs the Differences about Ceremonies be ſpeedily compoſed. And as I have often commended the Judgment of S. *Auguſtine*, concerning the obſerving of the Rites and Ceremonies of divers Churches, ſo I ſhall now commend it again, and conclude with it.

Thoſe things which we obſerve being not written, but delivered by Tradition, which are obſerved in the whole World, may be underſtood to be commended and appointed to be retained either by the Apoſtles themſelves, or by frequent Council, whoſe Authority in the Church is moſt ſafe, as that the *Paſſion*, the *Reſurrection*, the *Aſcenſion* of our Lord, and *the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt from Heaven*, are celebrated by yearly Commemoration, and whatever of the like Nature occurreth, which is obſerved wherever the Church hath enlarged her ſelf. But other things which are varied throughout the Parts and Regions of the World, as that ſome Faſt on the Sabbath, and others do not. Some receive the Body and Blood of Chriſt daily, others only upon certain Days, *&c.* All things of this Kind have free Obſervation. Nor is there any Diſcipline in theſe things more commendable to a grave and prudent Chriſtian, than that he behave himſelf conformably to the Church unto which he ſhall come; for whatever is enjoined neither contrary to the Faith nor good Manners, is to be accounted indifferent, and for the ſake of Communion with them among whom we live, ought to be obſerved. I believe you have ſometime heard me relate what I now repeat, That my Mother following me to *Millain*, found a Church which obſerved not the Sabbath-Faſt; ſhe began to doubt and be troubled what ſhe ſhould do; I valued not ſuch things, but for her ſake I conſulted in this Matter with that Man of bleſſed Memory, *Ambroſe*, who anſwered, That he could inſtruct me in nothing but his own Practice: For if he had known any thing better, he would have practiſed that. And when as I thought he would only have admoniſhed us by his Authority, without giving Reaſon that we ſhould not Faſt on the Sabbath, he thus informs me: When I am at *Rome* I faſt on the Sabbath; when I am here I faſt not: Do you ſo. To whatever Church you ſhall chance to come, obſerve the Cuſtoms of it, if you will not give an Occaſion of Scandal to any, nor that any ſcandalize you. When I declared this Advice to my Mother, ſhe readily embraced it. And often pondering this Saying, I ſtill eſteemed it as if it had been received by an Oracle from Heaven; for I often obſerved with Grief and Sorrow, That many Perturbations were created to the Infirm, by the contentious Obſtinacy, and ſuperſtitious Fear of ſome Brethren, who in Matters of this Kind, which cannot certainly be determined either by the Authority of Holy Scripture, or by the Tradition of the Univerſal Church, nor are conducing to the Amendment of Life, only having entertained ſome Opinions of their own, or having ſo accuſtomed to do in their own Country, or becauſe they ſuppoſe a Foreign Church more Learned than their own, they become ſo litigious that nothing will pleaſe them but what they do themſelves.

Calvin. Epiſt. ad N. N. Epiſt. 121. Epiſt. ad Januar.

Digitized by Google

Bez. *Epiſt.* 12.

MY Brethren (upon whom the Ceremonies were impoſed by the Church of *England*) asked my Advice what they ought to do. I anſwered by this Diſtinction, That the Condition of the Miniſters and of the People was not the ſame, and that many things may and ought to be tolerated which were not rightly commanded. And though theſe things were not in my Judgment rightly brought into the Church, yet ſeeing they are of the Nature of thoſe Things which are not in themſelves evil, they ſeem not to me to be of ſo great Moment, that for the ſake of them the Miniſters ſhould forſake their Office rather than wear ſuch Garments; or the People omit the publick Food of their Souls, rather than they will hear their Paſtors ſo cloathed. And I exhort, and in Humility and with Tears intreat my good and greatly reſpected Brethren of the Church of *England*, that (the Truth of the Doctrine and a good Conſcience being ſafe) they would patiently bear with one another, all bitterneſs of Mind being laid aſide, and heartily obey the Royal Majeſty, and all the Biſhops; and with Minds united in the Lord (though they do not yet think all the ſame Things) they would ſtedfaſtly withſtand *Satan*, who ſeeks all Occaſions of raiſing Tumults and infinite Calamities.

F I N I S.

The Judgment of Bucer, Luther *and* Melanchthon, *in favours of the Church of* England, *extracted out of their Works by* W. S. *D. D.*

HAving debated the Matters in Difference between the Presbyterians and Independents, and the *Church* of *England*, upon the Principles of Scripture, Reaſon, and their own Conceſſions, I will ſhew how much they act againſt the Principles of the chiefeſt Divines alſo, that firſt ſtood up in Oppoſition to the Poiſh Corruptions, and were the great Inſtruments of ſettling that Reformation, which has been called by the Name of the Proteſtant Religion, though now ſhamefully pretended as a Cloak to cover over the Rebellions, Hereſies, Schiſms, and all other Extravagancies which the Fanaticiſms of our late Times have produced. Now, though in the Heat of Contention with the Papiſts, while they oppoſe ſuperſtitious Uſages, and Abuſe of ancient Rites, they do not always expreſs themſelves with ſuch Caution as they might have done, neither were ſo careful many Times to diſtinguiſh the pious Uſe which might be made of them, from the intolerable Abuſe to which they were perverted; yet they have ſufficiently declared themſelves, that the Government, Conſtitutions and Ceremonies, of the Church of *England*, are not only lawful, but pious and profitable, for the Chriſtian Church, and peaceably to be ſubmitted to by all religious Perſons in their ſeveral Capacities.

And becauſe Mr. *B.* does ſo paſſionately deſire us to conſider the Writings of the Learn'd *Bucer*, writ in *England*, and for *England*, I will begin with him.

Bucer's

Digitized by Google

Bucer's *Judgment in favours of the Church of* England.

'THeſe Orders of Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, were perpetual in the Church, & inſtituted in the Beginning by the Holy Ghoſt—The Churches ordain'd their Metropolitans in every Province, every one of which was to take Care of the Biſhops of the Churches of his own Province—But there was no more Authority granted them, over other Biſhops or other Churches, than that they ſhould be concerned and preſide in all Elections, & Ordinations of Biſhops, but together with the reſt of the Biſhops of that Province, with all of them, if it were poſſible, or at leaſt with the neareſt, or as many as could be preſent—— The Judgments both concerning Doctrine and Manners, over all Clergy-men and Lay-Perſons, were in every Church in the Power of the Biſhop and Presbyter of each Church, [The Presbyter in his Pariſh, and the Biſhop in his Dioceſs.] The Judgments concerning the Biſhops, were in the Power of the provincial Council, all the Puniſhments were Suſpenſion towards thoſe that ſubmit to Penance, and Excommunication towards thoſe that did reject their Penance.

'And again to the ſame Purpoſe. Since it is our Lord's Pleaſure, that all his Diſciples ſhould mutually embrace and have a Care one of another, the Fathers did every where, as far as they could, (for all Chriſtians are but one Body) appoint, that the Biſhops of every Province, ſhould meet together with the Presbyters and Deacons, as often as the Occaſions of the Church did require, (which is now done at Viſitations and Epiſcopal Synods.) And ſhould inquire into the Doctrine and Diſcipline of *Chriſt*, that they might be adminiſtred, and flouriſh in all Churches; and that they might amend any Thing that they found amiſs, and might confirm and promote what they knew to be well.

'But that theſe Synods might be rightly and orderly managed, they would have the Metropolitans, the Biſhops of every Metropolis, have the Preſidency in calling and moderating them; and therefore they did lay upon theſe Metropolitans, the Charge and Care of all the Churches throughout their Province. That if they underſtood there was any Thing that was not well inſtituted, or done by the Miniſters of the Churches, or the People, they ſhould admoniſh them of it in due Time; and if they did not amend by their Admonition, that they ſhould call a Synod of Biſhops to correct it. For nothing of Judgment was committed to them, which they could exerciſe by their own Authority over the Churches, which had proper Biſhops of their own; for all the Judgment over the People and the Clergy, was in the Power of the Biſhop and the Presbytery, [that is reſpectively] but the Synod did judge the Biſhops.

'When Biſhops were to be ordained in Churches, it was appointed that the Metropolitan and all the Biſhops of the Province ſhould meet together at that Church (if it could conveniently be done) and if with ſome only, not with leſs than Two or Three, who were to govern the Election of the Biſhop, if it were to be then made, *&c.* and then at length, to ordain him to the Epiſcopal Function. All which Things were inſtituted, and did prevail, that there might be a Knowledge and mutual Care between the Churches and their Miniſters, as much as was poſſible, and to drive away and remove all Offences concerning Doctrine and Manners, and to uphold, promote, and render the Edification of Faith, and of a Life worthy the Lord *Chriſt* more effectual. So that if any did recede from their Office, the reſt of the Biſhops might provide Relief even to the Suſpenſion of thoſe that were obſtinate, and alſo to the caſting them out of their Epiſcopal Charge.

—— And then concluding the Order of Government, he ſays, 'But becauſe it is altogether neceſſary, that all Clergy-men ſhould have their Keepers and Curatros, as the Authority and Power of Biſhops, and alſo of Arch-Deacons and all others, by what Names ſoever they are called, to whom any Portion of ruling and governing the Clergy is committed, is to be reſtored, ſo alſo the Vigilance and Animadverſion, that no one in this Order be altogether without a Guard over him.

'But

Digitized by Google

'But who shall judge among so many Churches, of which some follow the Pope 'of *Rome*, &c. others do not? I answer (*says he*) National and General Councils. 'But what if some, by a schismatical Spirit, do oppose those Things which are 'rightly and piously decreed by a Council? *R.* These are to be condemned by the 'Council as guilty of Heresy, (or Schism, by the same Parity of Reason, *&c.*) that 'they may be avoided by the Saints. *And then presently after, speaking of the Magistrate, he asks this Question,* 'Does the Care of Religion pertain unto him? *R.* First of all; 'for all Power is of God, which they that have received it from the Lord, ought so to 'administer it, as to be a Furtherance to those that are good, and a Terror to those 'that are evil.

And then, shewing the great Mischiefs that arise from the Contempt of Ecclesiastical Authority, he says, 'There are many that are simple and understand little, who 'cannot direct and govern themselvrs by their own Discretion; and we all love our 'selves too much: So that we cannot rightly know and judge of our own Actions. 'Wherefore, unless we think well and highly of them whom the Lord has set over us, 'who should instruct, exhort, and admonish and chide us in his Name, unless we 'receive their Word and Doctrine, with all Fear and Trembling, as the Word and 'Doctrine of the Lord, the Obedience of Piety will never have any place in us, neither 'will it be able to grow up, as we see with our Eyes, and daily find by Experience. 'For where this Authority and Observance of the Ministers is not, there we see there 'will be no true Church, nor Appearance of Piety. And so it ought to be: For God 'will rule altogether by his Ministers, as we have demonstrated in the Third Chapter. If these be heard, then He is heard; if they be despised, then *Christ* and His 'Father are despised.

And having thus written of the Government of the Church, upon his Death-bed he did after this Manner express himself, says Mr. *Car*, that wrote of his Death, 'How 'often have I heard him deploring the Desolation of *Germany*, and that with the most 'passionate Expressions, and looking up to Heaven as he prayed to Almighty God, 'that He would have Pity on his own Nation, so that He would not suffer *England* to 'fall into the same Vices which brought that Destruction upon *Germany* long before: 'And that he was afraid, that in the great Heat of Desire that was in many, of knowing God, and reforming the Church, while Discipline was wanting, whereby wicked Men were chastised, and Order in the Ministry was kept up, their good Endeavours could not long make any Progress. This he did often say, but then most vehemently, when he did, as it were, like a pious Father, embrace this Church of '*England* as a Daughter, in his Arms, and with his last Breath commend her to the 'King's Majesty and all good Men; and did wish in our Hearing, that what Things 'he had written to the King's Majesty concerning the Discipline of the Church, might 'find a Place and Settlement in this flourishing Kingdom, which was without Controversy a House of God. And that he did hope, if that were done, that no Calamity, no Deformity could happen to this Common-wealth: But if it were done, 'God would not be so much appeased with the Desire of a Few to reform the Church, 'as he would be provoked by the Wickedness and Luxury of many others.

Bucer. *Scrip. Angl. p.* 565. *p.* 566. *p.* 581. *p.* 583. *p.* 232. *p.* 852. *p.* 874. *p.* 875.

And herein this pious Man was not mistaken, but proved a fatal Prophet of our late sad Disasters; for by the giddy Zeal of some busy Reformers in Forty One, and onward, wherein Discipline was taken away; not only the King and Kingdom were destroyed, but the Church has been almost overwhelmed with numberless Schisms and Heresies; and we can never hope (as that holy Man did foresee) to avoid the like Confusion, while the Authority of the Church, and all Discipline, is so shamefully trodden under Foot, and despised as it is by our Dissenters.

Bucer's *Judgment of the Ceremonies and Circumstances of Worship.*

'NOw let us see how the Discipline of Ceremonies is to be restored into the Churches. 'But these are necessary Ceremonies, and common to Christians: The Sanctification or setting apart of Places in which the Religion of *Christ* is to be publickly administred: The Sanctification of setting apart of Times in which People may meet together in the Lord, and attend upon the Duties of Religion: A certain Administration of the Word

Digitized by Google

'Word, Sacraments, Modification of Discipline, &c. First of all, Christians ought 'to have certain Places appointed for Holy Assemblies, and for the Religious Duties 'delivered by *Christ* the Lord; which ought not to be applied to any other Use, un- 'less some great Necessity does force it. Which our Lord did effectually teach us, 'when He cast out of the Temple, those that held a Market, though it were only for 'Sacrifices, which were to be offered in it; and overthrew the Tables of the Money- 'Changers, by which Strangers were helped to make their Sacrifices, and to offer 'the Gifts which were partly commanded, and partly commended in the Law of 'God, &c.

'It is agreeable to our Piety, to sanctify certain Days with the Memorial of the 'principal Works of the Lord, by which he did perfect our Redemption; as the Day 'of his Incarnation, Nativity, Epiphany, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and 'Pentecost. We teach Men so to celebrate the Memorials of the Saints, which live 'with our Lord *Christ*, and concerning whom we have the Histories of the Scriptures, 'or other Books of good Credit, that it might be propounded to the Church of God, 'what Gifts their and our God and Father has bestowed upon them through our 'common Saviour: And that we may give Thanks to God for them, and that we 'may rejoice with them, as being our Members; and by this Means we might the 'more stir up our selves to trust in the Grace of God, and to imitate their Faith.

'The Third common Ceremony of Christians, is the Manner and Ordering of the 'Holy Actions in the Sacred Assemblies of *Christ*, as the Administration of the Word, 'Sacraments and Discipline of *Christ*; Prayers and Psalms and such like, that they 'may be exhibited and administred to all People religiously, decently and in Order, 'and to the true Edification of Faith ——— But such Churches as are in the same Nation 'or Kingdom, since the Dispositions of Men there do not greatly vary, it is not only 'comely, but very profitable to increase the Esteem of *Christ*'s Holy Offices, that as 'much as they can, they should observe Conformity in these Matters; which can ne- 'ver be done but by prescribing Forms and Rules how all Things shall be performed, 'as he knew it was done then in our Church, and desired the Continuance and Settle- 'ment of it at his Death.

P. 45. *P.* 48. *P.* 182. *P.* 50.

Bucer's *Judgment of the Sign of the Cross.*

'I Esteem the Sign of the Cross decent and profitable to be used, not so much because it was of ancient Use in the Church, as because it is very simple, and of present Ad- 'monition of the Cross of *Christ*. *P.* 479.

Bucer's *Judgment of the Surplice.*

'WHether we will or no, we must confess, that Difference of Habits in those that bear Civil Offices amongst Men that are rightly educated, do become a Means 'of special Reverence towards Magistrates; and what does now hinder, but the same 'may come to pass in Religious Ministration ——— Let us consider what the Holy 'Ghost does teach us concerning the Signification of the Woman's Vail, and the Man's 'Head being uncovered. 1 *Cor.* 10. Why does he make Mention of the shining Gar- 'ments of Angels by Name? For he does not without Cause. But I have written 'more largely of this Matter to *John a Lesco*.

It is manifest our Lord *Christ* has prescribed the Substance only of the Ministry of 'the Word and Sacraments in His own Words, and left it to the Church to ordain all 'other Matters which pertain to the decent and profitable Administration of the Holy 'Mysteries. From whence it comes to pass, that we do not celebrate the Holy Sup- 'per, neither in the Evening, nor in a private House, neither lying along and with 'Men only: For these Things, concerning Time and Place, and Habit of the Body 'in celebrating or receiving the Lord's Supper, and of admitting Women to the Ho- 'ly Communion, of the manner of our Prayers and Hymns to God, and also concer- 'ning Garments, and other Things which pertain to external Decency; I do not 'doubt but he has given free Liberty to His Church to determine and make such Or- 'ders concerning these Things, which every Church shall judge most conducing a-

'mongst

'mongſt their People to keep up and increaſe their Reverence towards all Sacred 'Things which belong unto our Lord. If therefore any Churches from this Liberty 'of *Chriſt*, and to this End, for Edification of the Chriſtian People, would have their 'Miniſters uſe any particular Garments in their Sacred Adminiſtrations, all Superſti-'tion being removed, and all Levity, and all Diſſenſion amongſt Brethren, that is, 'Abuſe: I do not ſee certainly how ſuch Churches can be condemned as guilty of any 'Sin, much leſs of having any Communion with Antichriſt. Who would now 'condemn the Church of Impiety, if by any pure and holy Conceit they had that Cu-'ſtom, That every one when he did partake of the Lord's Supper, ſhould wear a white 'Garment, as thoſe that were newly baptiſed formerly did?

'For if any ſhould contend, That ſuch a Liberty is not permitted to any Church of 'Chriſt, he muſt of neceſſity confeſs one of theſe Things, either that nothing is allow'd 'to be appointed in the Churches, of which they have not the expreſs Command of 'Chriſt; by which Means they will condemn all Churches of wicked Boldneſs. For 'all do obſerve Time and Place, and Habite of their Bodies in the Celebration of the 'H. Supper; and do admit Women into their Communion, of all which things they 'have not only no Command of the Lord, but contrary Example. ----

'Or it is impoſſible, that there ſhould be Churches which our Lord does ſo far free 'from all Suſpicion and Abuſe of his good Creatures, that of thoſe that are pure by 'Faith in his Name, all the Creatures of God are good, and of pure Signification in 'their Uſe. Which whoſoever ſhall ſay, he by that Means will deny that Chriſt 'our Lord is ſuch an One to all, which he promiſed himſelf to be, to deliver them 'from all Uncleanneſs.

'For that wicked Men by their Abuſe, may ſo ſpoil God's Creatures which are 'good of themſelves, that they can be ſerviceable to no pious Man, to any holy Uſe, 'which is manifeſtly againſt the Teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt, *Rom.* 14. 1. 1 *Cor.* 8. '9. 1 *Tim.* 4. Or that at leaſt it is not lawful for Chriſtians to diſpoſe any things to 'put them in Mind of their and our Creator, and of his Benefits towards us, and our 'Duties towards him, which is oppoſite to that which the Spirit does every where 'teach concerning our acknowledging and worſhipping God in all his Works, 'and doing all things in the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to the Glory of the 'Father.

'All theſe Abſurdities are to be avoided by pious Men. Neither ought we to 'fear that Evil which is wont to be objected. If there be ſuch a Liberty granted to 'the Church, that they may inſtitute any Things for pious Significations and Admoni-'tions, it might come to paſs, that they may bring in all the Aaronical Rights of the '*Roman* Antichriſt, or of the *Gentiles* in our Religious Solemnities. For the Church-'es which I have deſcribed, and to which I think that Liberty of which I am treat-'ing cannot be denied, will ſo take and order all Rites and Garments to their uſe, 'that they may ſerve to illuſtrate and not obſcure the Goſpel of our Lord Jeſus 'Chriſt, as it is amongſt true Chriſtians in the uſe of all external Rites not appoint-'ed by our Lord in any expreſs Command.

'But to anſwer more fully Mr. *B*'s Charge againſt me, of ſpeaking like one of *Re-hoboam*'s puny Counſellors, contrary to all Experience, let him conſult his commen-ded *Bucer*, and he ſhall find him of my Mind, rather than me of his in this Matter.

A

Digitized by Google

A Continuation of Bucer's *Judgment of the Surplice.*

'SINCE the Magistrates have supreme Authority over all, therefore above all they ought to take care that live orderly and well, and each Man discharge his Duty: They are bound before all things to look after this, that no Man live under them which is not continually sought after, and helped forward to Christ. — This Magistrates will rightly take care of, when after the Example of ancient, pious Princes and Magistrates, which ruled amongst the Primitive Christians, they shall so appoint the Ministry and Cure of Souls, that the Churches remain unhurt by Wolves, neither are oppressed by Hirelings, and have their faithful and industrious Ministers which administer the Pastoral Care of Souls faithfully and in all due Manner. ---- Concerning which Matter we have the Constitution of the ancient Christian *Cæsars*, in which they permit none to introduce any false Doctrine or Schism, from the Communion of *Christ*, neither publickly in the Place of the publick Ministry of the Church, nor privately in Corners to each several Person. Moreover, they permit no Man, who is baptized into the Name of Christ, to withdraw himself from the Communion of the Church and Use of the Sacraments; for they who do not abide in the Communion of Christ, [that is, by abiding in the Communion of his Church] they condemn them as Apostles, neither do they admit them to any Honours or publick Offices. But they who join themselves to any Sects, they drive them away from this their Perdition, by pecuniary Mulcts and other grievous Punishments. Which Laws and Constitutions we have in *Cod. De summa Trin. & Fid. Cath. l. nullus*, and in the whole Title *De Hæreticis*, and also in *Novellis Const.* 109. and these Imperial Laws S. *Augustine* does praise, and defend that they are Christian and wholesome. ---- And as the merciful God and faithful Father, who does for our Good try both troublesome Things and pleasant.---- So that holy Bishop and faithful Curate of Souls, *Augustine*, is found, by Experience in some Thousands who were brought by the Punishments of the Emperors, from the Sects of the Donatists, to the true Communion of Christ; and that God by Punishments and severe Compulsion, did make false Doctrines and Heresies, and all Contempt of Religion irksome to Men, and did first by that Means, bring them to hear sound Doctrine, and that they did not seduce or offend any Body, and then by Doctrine did bestow upon them his Spirit, which does free them wholly from their Errors, and endue them with a Love and Zeal for the Truth.

P. 709. *P.* 708. *P.* 297. *P.* 298, 299.

Thus the Learned *Bucer*, who was so hated by the Papists, that they digg'd up his Bones and burnt them publickly at *Cambridge*, after he had been buried above Four Years; but the Protestants did so honour him, that they did solemnly abrogate that Order for his Burning, and publickly do write again to his Memory in a General Synod, and the University Orator made a Speech, and then the *Regius Professor* preach'd upon that Occasion.

Luther's *Agreement with the Church of* England, *and the Churches that are called after him.*

Luther's *Judgment of Episcopal Government.*

NEXT to *Bucer*'s, I will set down *Luther*'s Judgment concerning the present Matters; and because it can appear no where better, than in the publick Confession offered to the Emperor, which was set forth as their most deliberate Resolution, and ever since the Form of the Profession that is still kept amongst them

Digitized by Google

them. I will begin with that. And first, in the Preface to the Reader, they say, 'We hope all good Men will understand, that we profess no Doctrine contrary to 'the Holy Scripture and the Catholick Church.--- We reprehend these Vices, not 'that we might dissolve the Ecclesiastical Polity, but that we might illustrate the 'Glory of Christ, and restore the Gospel to its Native Purity.

And then in the Confession it self.

'This is the Sum of the Doctrine which is delivered in our Churches, and we judge 'to be agreeable to the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles, and the Catholick 'Church, and lastly to the *Roman* Church, as she is known out of approved Writers, 'and we hope all good and Learned Men will judge the same. For we do not de-'spise the Consent of the Catholick Church, neither is it our Intention to bring into 'the Church any new Opinion and unknown to the Holy Church. Neither will we 'patronize any wicked or seditious Opinions, which the Catholick Church has con-'demned. For we were not led to embrace this Doctrine by any evil Concupiscence, 'but compelled to it by the Authority of the Word of God, and *of the Ancient 'Church.*

'What shall we think of the LORD's Day, and such like Rites belonging to the 'Church? To these Things they answer, That it is lawful for the Bishops or Pa-'stors to prescribe Rules that these things may be done orderly in the Church.--- 'Such are the Observation of the Lord's Day, *Easter*, *Whitsuntide*, and the like Holy 'Days and Rites.----- The Bishops might easily retain Men in due Obedience, if 'they would not urge them to observe Traditions, which cannot be observed with a 'good Conscience.--- The Churches do not desire that the Bishops should make up 'a Concord with the Loss of their Honour.--- Only they desire, that those unjust 'Burdens may be remitted, which are new, and received beside the Tradition of the 'Catholick Church.--- We do not go about, that the Ruling Authority of Bishops 'should be taken away from them, but this one thing is desired, That they would 'permit the Gospel to be purely preached, and would remit some few Observations, 'which cannot be observed without Sin.'

Confess. August. *Cap.* 21. *Cap. de* Protest. *Eccles.*

Luther's *Judgment of the Publick Set-Form of Prayers and Ceremonies.*

'OUr Churches are falsly accused that they abolish the *Missa* or publick Liturgy; 'for the *Missa* or publick Prayers and Administration of the Lord's Supper are 'still retained and celebrated amongst us, with the highest Reverence, and almost all 'the usual Ceremonies are still observed.

'Most of the usual Traditions which conduce to this, that things should be done 'orderly in the Church, are observed by us, such as the Order of the Lessons and the 'principal Holy-Days.

Hitherto we have had the Words of the Confession; let us see what *Luther* himself says. And though no Man did more abhor the Popish Doctrine concerning the Mass, yet he is not afraid to use the Word *Missa* in a better Sense, as it was anciently done. Hence he describes the Order of the publick Worship at *Wittemberg*, and begins thus, *A Form of the* Missa *and Communion for the Church of* Wittemberg. And then sets down the several Parts of it according to the usual Order with the Creed, Psalms, Lessons, Hours, and Holy-Days.

And says, 'Tis comely and necessary that Children should be accustomed to the 'reading and hearing Psalms and Lessons of the Holy Scriptures; but if any thing here 'ought to be altered, it may be changed by the Discretion of the Bishop." (As he does permit in many other Circumstances, and as our Church does in many Cases leave it to the Ordinary.)

'The Church does pray in her Prayers, That we being stirred up by the Exam-'ples of the Saints, may imitate the Virtue of their Passion, and does sing what great 'Torments the Saints did suffer, that they might securely come to the Crown of 'Martyrdom: From which Words and Songs of the Church we understand, the Fe-'stivals of the Saints, their Memorials, Temples, Altars, Names, Images, are there-

fore

Digitized by Google

'fore celebrated and multiplied, that we may be animated by their Example to endure the same Evils which they suffered.

Again, 'If it be thought good that the Communion Service should be sung, let it 'be sung.

And then afterwards, 'I omitted to speak any thing concerning Garments, but we 'think concerning them as we do of other Rites. We allow Churches Liberty freely 'to use them, so as Vanity and Excess be avoided. But what Order they observe, we shall by and by learn from *Melanchthon*.

'We are not bound to the Mosaical Ceremonies, much less these of the Pope, but 'because our Bodily Life cannot want Ceremonies and Rites; for there must be some 'Pedagogy: The Gospel does permit that Constitutions should be made concerning 'Holidays, about Times and Places, that People may know on what Day, at what 'Hour, and in what Place they ought to meet to hear the Word of God.

'This Rule is every where to be observed concerning Ceremonies, that the Unskilful, Rude and Negligent might be stirred up by them to learn the Will of God in 'His Word, to offer up their Prayers, and call upon the Name of the Lord: If this be 'done, which Way soever it be, it is well done. ---

'It is permitted to the Pastors in all Churches to institute such Ceremonies as are 'serviceable to the Word, that is, to the Knowledge of God, and the Salvation of 'Man. For this Care is committed to them, that many may be invited to the Word, 'and accustomed to Piety.

'Here we may deservedly lament the Ruin of true Discipline; for because we were 'compelled to cast away the Popish Ceremonies, many are of that Opinion, That 'there should be no place left for any Ceremonies in the Church; therefore if any out 'of a pious Intention should command a Fast of certain Days, or should exhort Men to 'Amendment of Life and serious Prayer, what Reproaches would he hear amongst 'us, as now Men's Humours are? They would cry out presently, Popery is coming 'about again, our Christian Liberty is in Danger. But do you consider this, O People, hear the Prophet to whom it does not seem enough to propound the pure 'Doctrine of true Repentance; but he would have a solemn Assembly appointed, and 'certain Times set apart for Fasting---- For these are Means by which the Holy Ghost 'does stir up our Minds.

Luther, upon the Epistle to the *Galatians*, written in the Year 1538, Twenty Years after his first appearing against the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, and when he had by Experience found the Mischief of the Phanatick Spirit, that set up it self contrary to the Publick Order and Government of the Church, commenting on these Words, *Paul an Apostle not of Men, neither by Man*, [says, *By, of Men.*]

'I understand such who call and thrust in themselves, when neither God nor Man 'sent them, but such as run and speak of themselves. As the Fanatick Spirits now a-'days, who creep into Corners, and seek out Places where they may spread their Poison, and do not enter into the publick Churches, or come hither where the Gospel 'is already planted; these I call *of Men*. [*By Men*] are such as have a Divine Call, 'but yet by Men; for the Divine Call is twofold, one mediate, the other immediate. 'God does call us all now to the Ministry of the Word mediately; but the Apostles 'were called by *Christ* himself: The Apostles afterwards called their Disciples, as '*Paul* called *Timothy* and *Titus*, &c. who afterwards called the Bishops, as *Tit.* 1. The 'Bishops called their Successors, and that Call continued to our Times, and shall 'continue to the End of the World: And 'tis a mediate Call, because it is by Men, yet 'it is Divine---- And this is the general Call over all the World after the Apostles; 'neither is it to be changed, but highly esteemed, by Reason of some Fanatical Men 'which despise it, and boast of another better Call, whereby they say, they are moved by 'the Spirit to teach. But such Impostors ly; they are moved by a Spirit indeed, but not a 'good but a wicked Spirit. It is not lawful for me to go out of my own Charge in to another City, where I am not called to be a Minister--- Wherefore we must not run into 'another Man's Charge, as the Devil doth stir up his Ministers to run where they are 'not called, and pretend a fervent Zeal, and that they are grieved that Men are so 'miserably seduced, that they will teach them the Truth, and pluck those that are 'mailed out of the Snares of the Devil. And indeed if any out of a pious Zeal and 'good Intention, would by sound Doctrine, free those from Error which are seduced; 'yet it would give evil Example, by which Occasion is offered to wicked Teachers to

'thrust

Digitized by Google

'thruſt in themſelves, by whom *Satan* does afterward Rule and do much Hurt ---- 'This is the firſt Aſſault St. *Paul* makes againſt falſe Apoſtles which run when no 'Body ſends them; therefore a Call is not to be deſpiſed. Neither is it enough to 'have the Word of God and pure Doctrine, but our Call muſt be certain; without 'which, he that entereth cometh to kill and to deſtroy. For God does never proſper 'the Labour of thoſe that are not called; and tho' they bring ſome wholeſome Do-'ctrines, yet they do not edify.

Again, ſpeaking of Perſons ſeduced by Sectaries, ſays, 'They ſay the *Lutherans* are 'not the only Men that are wiſe, 'tis not they only that preach *Chriſt*, 'tis not they 'alone that have the Spirit, the Gifts of Prophecy, and the right Interpretation of 'Scripture. Our Teachers are no way inferior to them, and exceed them too by many Degrees; for they are led by the Spirit and teach us ſpiritual Things; but the *Lutherans* have never yet attained to the true Divinity, but reſt in the dead Letter; and therefore teach nothing elſe but Catechiſm, Faith, Charity, *&c.*

Cap. *de Miſſa. De Deſcr. Cib.* Tom. 2. Fol. 556. Fol. 560. Tom. 1. Fol. 308. Tom. 2. Fol. 558. Tom. 4. Fol. 120. Tom. 4. Fol. 601. Tom. 4. p. 6, 7, 8. Fol. 3.

Luther's *Judgment of Excommunication.*

'THis is a Place concerning Excommunication, and that as the Church is Twofold; 'for one is political or outward and viſible, which the Church uſes againſt thoſe 'that are notorious Offenders, according to the Command of *Chriſt*, *Matth.* 18. that 'Rule is altogether to be obſerved in the Church; neither is Excommunication a light 'Matter, which does utterly exclude Men from the Kingdom of *Chriſt*, and does re-'tain Sins without Forgiveneſs, unleſs they do repent. ---- Take heed how you 'deſpiſe this Excommunication lawfully inſtituted by the Church, for it brings the 'certain Sentence of the Wrath of God and eternal Damnation, as *Chriſt* ſaith, *Verily I ſay unto you, whatſoever ye ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven.*

Tom. 4. Fol. 682.

Melanchthon's *Judgment.*

NExt to *Luther*'s, I will ſet down the Judgment of *Melanchthon*, his pious and learn'd Diſciple, who was choſen out to write the Apology in Defence of the *Auſperg* or *Auguſtane* Confeſſion, in the Name of the ſeveral Princes of *Germany*, and others, that aſſented to it, and extant amongſt *Luther*'s Works, written in the Year 1538, Twenty Years after the firſt Proteſtation againſt the Errors of the *Roman* Church.

Melanchthon's *Judgment of the Authority of Biſhops, and Obſervation of the ancient Canons.*

'OUr Adverſaries receive the Fourteenth Article, in which we ſay, that none ought 'to be permitted to adminiſter the Word and Sacraments, but thoſe that are 'orderly called, if we would but uſe the Canonical Ordination. Concerning this 'Matter we have often teſtified in this Aſſembly, that we do moſt earneſtly deſire to 'preſerve the Eccleſiaſtical Polity, and thoſe Degrees that are in the Church, though 'made at firſt by humane Authority. For we know, that Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline was 'appointed by the Fathers in this Manner, as the ancient Canons do deſcribe it, upon 'very good and profitable Conſiderations----

'Moreover here we do teſtify again, That we would willingly preſerve the Ec-'cleſiaſtical and Canonical Polity, if the Biſhops would leave off to exerciſe their 'Cruelty againſt our Churches; and this our Will ſhall excuſe us before God, and be-'fore all the World, to all Poſterity, that it cannot be imputed to us, that the Autho-'rity of Biſhops is diminiſhed or taken away.

Me-

Digitized by Google

Melanchton's *Judgment of Hypocrites being in the Visible Church, and receiving the Sacrament from wicked Ministers.*

'WE acknowledge many Hypocrites and evil Men are mingled with the good in this Life, and have the Fellowship of outward Signs, and are Members of the Church, as to the Participation of outward Signs, and therefore do bear Offices in the Church Neither does it take away from the Efficacy of the Sacraments, that they are administred by the Ungodly; because by reason of the Appointment of the Church, they represent the Person of *Christ*, and do not represent their own Persons, as *Christ* himself doth testify, *He that heareth you, heareth me*, when they administer the Word and Sacraments, they do administer it in the stead and place of *Christ*. But we have spoken clearly enough to this Point in our Confession, where we reject the *Donatists* and *Wicklifts*, who do think they do sin, who receive the Sacraments in the Church from Ministers that are unworthy.

Tom. 4, Fol. 192.

Of Rites and Ceremonies, and the Church's Power to institute them.

'WE think that the Difference of Rites instituted by Men, do not hurt the Unity of the Church, though it is very pleasing to us, that universal Rites should be observed for Peace sake. As we do willingly observe in our Churches the Order of the publick Liturgy, the Lord's Day, and other special Holy-days; and do with a most ready Mind receive the profitable and ancient Constitutions, especially because they contain a Pedagogy which leads to Instruction; wherefore it is profitable to teach and accustom the People, and those that are unskilful to their Use.

'Although the Holy Fathers themselves had Ceremonies and Traditions, yet they did not think these Things profitable or necessary to Justification; they did not obscure the Glory and Office of *Christ*, but did teach that we are justified by Faith for *Christ*'s sake, and not for our human Forms of Worship. But they did observe them for bodily Convenience, that the People might know what Time to meet together, that all Things might be done orderly and gravely in the Temples, for Example's sake: And lastly, that the common People might have a kind of Pedagogy to instruct them. For Distinctions of Times and Variety of Ceremonies are of Use to admonish the common People.

---'For these Causes we also judge Traditions may be rightly observed---- We willingly retain the ancient Traditions which were delivered in the Church for Convenience and Peace, and we interpret them most favourably, shutting out that Opinion of their Justification. And our Adversaries do falsly accuse us, that we abolish the good Ordinances and Discipline of the Church. For we can truly say, that the publick Order of the Churches is much more honoured by us than by our Adversaries; and if any will rightly weigh it, we do more truly observe the Canons than our Adversaries----- For amongst us many receive the Lord's Supper every Lord's-Day, but they are first instructed, examined and absolved. Children sing the Psalms that they may learn them; and the People sing them, that they may either learn or pray.

'In this Assembly we have sufficiently showed, that out of Charity we would willingly observe any indifferent Things with others, though they had some Inconvenience; but we did judge, that publick Concord, which could be made without any Offence to our Consciences (that is, without the Breach of any Law of God, for there can be no other just Offence to Conscience) was to be preferred before all other Conveniences.

Fol. 193. Fol. 206. Fol. 207. Fol. 208.

Of

Digitized by Google

Of the Liturgie, Holy-Days, Surplice, &c.

'WE muſt make this Declaration again in the Beginning, that we do not aboliſh 'the publick Liturgy, but do religiouſly retain and defend it. For the pu-'blick Service of the Church is celebrated amongſt us upon all Lord's Days, and other 'Holy-Days, in which the Lord's Supper is adminiſtred to them that will receive it; 'and they are tried and abſolved before. And the uſual publick Ceremonies, the Or-'der of the Leſſons, Prayers, Garments, and ſuch like, are ſtill retained and obſerved 'by us.

Fol. 216.

Mr. Baxter's *Judgment of thoſe Ceremonies in the Church of* England, *which are not generally enjoined, but only a particular Practice in ſome Places, and it may be a particular Command there, ſuch as* Altars, Adoration *or* bowing to the Eaſt, Organs, *&c. collected by* Stileman.

Of Altars and Rails.

THE Name and Form of an Altar (*e*), no doubt it is a Thing indifferent, and the primitive Churches uſed the Name of Sacrifice, Altar and Prieſt, and I think lawfully for my part—— but metaphorically, as the Scripture doth.

(*e*) Baxt. *Five Diſput. Diſp.* 5. Cap. 2. § 5.

Of Adoration and bowing towards the Eaſt.

GOd who hath commanded us (*f*) to expreſs our Minds in ſeveral Caſes about His Worſhip, (as Profeſſion of Faith, Confeſſion of Sins, *&c.*) hath by that Means made it our Duty to ſignify our Conſent by ſome convenient Sign—— And the ſpecial Sign is left to our own, or our Governour's Determination (*g*): And to this End, and on theſe Terms, was adoring with their Faces toward the Eaſt, uſed heretofore by Chriſtians—— *as a* Signification of their own Mind inſtead of Words.

(*f*) Baxt. *ibid.* § 17. (*g*) *Id. ibid.* § 18.

Of Organs and Muſick.

HE that hath commanded us to chearfully to ſing Praiſes (*h*), hath not told us, whether we ſhall uſe the Meeter, or any Melodious Tune to help us; or whether we ſhall uſe, or not uſe a Muſical Inſtrument, or the Help of more Artificial Singers or Choriſters. Theſe are left to our own Reaſon to determine, *&c. And again* (*i*), The Organs or other Inſtruments of Muſick in God's Worſhip, being an Help partly Natural, and partly Artificial, to the exhilarating our Spirits for the Praiſe of God; I know no Argument to prove them ſimply unlawful, but what would prove a Cup of Wine unlawful, ſo the Tune, and Meeter, and Melody of Singing, unlawful.

(*h*) Baxt. *ibid.* § 22. (*i*) *Id. ibid.* § 45.

Of the Ring in Marriage.

IN Civil Actions (*k*) that are Religious only Finally, and by Participation, it is lawful to uſe Symbolical Rites, that are in their Kind near of Kin to Sacraments in their Kind, and may be called Civil Sacraments; ſuch as the ſealing and delivering of Indentures, or other Covenant Writings; the Delivery of Poſſeſſion of an Houſe by a Key; of the Temple, by a Book and Bell-rope; of Land, by a Turf or Twig; and of Civil Government, by a Crown, Scepter, or Sword, *&c. And again,* (*l*) For the Ring

Digitized by Google

Ring in Marriage, I see no Reason to scruple the Lawfulness of it: For though the Papists make a Sacrament of Marriage, yet we have no Reason to take it for an Ordinance of Divine Worship, any more than the solemnizing of a Contract between Prince and People. — The Ceremonies of a King's Coronation might as well be scrupled as those of Marriage, *&c.*

(*k*) Baxt. *ibid.* § 23. (*l*) *Id. ibid.* § 43.

Of the Surplice.

IF the Magistrate (*p*) do impose the Surplice, who is a lawful Governour, as a decent Habit for a Minister in God's Service, he meddleth with nothing but what is within the Reach of his own Power. Some decent Habit (saith he) is necessary, either the Magistrate or Minister himself or associated Pastors must determine what-- If the Magistrate or Synod tye all to one Habit, (I suppose it indecent) yet this is but an impudent Use of Power, it is a thing within their Reach, they do not an Alien Work, but their own Work amiss, and therefore, the thing it self being lawful, I would obey and use that Garment. 2. Yea, though secondarily the Whiteness be to signify Purity, and so it be made a teaching Sign, yet would I obey: For secondarily, we may lawfully and piously make teaching Signs of our Food and Rayment, and every thing we see.

(*p*) Baxt. *Five Disput.. Disp.* 5. *C.* 2. § 40.

Of Kneeling at the Communion.

I Did obey the Imposers (*q*), and would if it were to do again, rather than disturb the Peace of the Church, or be deprived of its Communion. For God having made some Gesture necessary, and confined me to none, but left it to humane Determination, I shall submit to Magistrates in their proper Work even when they miss in the Manner. I am not sure that Christ intended the Example of Himself or His Apostles as obligatory to us, that shall succeed; I am sure it proves sitting lawful, I am not sure, it proves it necessary: But I am sure, He hath commanded me Obedience and Peace.

(*q*) Baxt. *Five Disp. Disp.* 5. *C.* 2. § 42.

Of the Cross in Baptism.

TO this end (*r*), (viz. *to be a professing Sign,*) was the Sign of the Cross used heretofore by Christians. — And therefore I durst not have reproved any of the ancient Christians, that used the Sign of the Cross, meerly as a professing signal Action, to shew to the Heathen and *Jews* about them, that they believed in a crucified Christ, and were not ashamed of the Cross. — Nor will I now condemn a Man, that living among the Enemies of a crucified Christ, shall wear a Cross upon his Hat, or on his Breast, or set it on his Doors, or other convenient Place, meerly as a professing Sign of his Mind, to be but instead of many Words, *q. d.* (*I thus profess my self the Servant of a crucified Christ, of whom I am not ashamed.*) Whether these things be fit or unfit, the Time, the Place, and Occasions, and other Circumstances must shew, but the Lawfulness I dare not deny.

(*r*) Baxt. *Five Disput. Disp.* 5. *C.* 2. § 18, 19.

I shall add what Mr. *Baxter* saith in his *Christian Directory* on Quest. 83, of the People's bearing a Part in Divine Service. Saith he,

1. *The Scripture no where forbids it.*

2. *If the People may do this in the Psalms in Metre, there can be no Reason given, but they may lawfully do it in Prose.*

3. *The Primitive Christians were so full of Zeal and Love of Christ, that they would have taken it for an Injury, or the quenching of the Spirit, to have been wholly restrained from bearing a Part in the Praises of the Church.*

4. *The*

Digitized by Google

4. *The Use of the Tongue keeps awake the Mind, and stirs up God's Graces in his Servants.*

5. *It was the Decay of Zeal in the People, that first shut out the Responses: While they kept up the ancient Zeal, they were inclined to take their Part vocally in the Worship.*

Mr. Baxter's *Judgment of Church-Government, as it is collected by Dr.* Saywell.

Christ hath instituted a Ministry to be for ever established in the World, to preach the Gospel, to convert Volunteers unto Faith and Holiness, and to gather by Baptism all Consenters unto his Covenant and Church, and to teach them all that he hath commanded them: And this none have Power to overthrow. He hath stated on the Pastors of such Churches, the Power afore described, of teaching Assemblies and particular Persons, of leading them in publick Worship and Sacraments, and of judging by the Power of the Keys, whom to receive into their Communion by Baptism, and Profession of Faith, and whom to admonish, and for obstinate Impenitents to reject, and this Institution none may alter.

Christ's Laws impower and oblige the Bishops or Senior Pastors to ordain others for this Ministerial Service of the Church, and so to propagate their Order to the End of the World: By which Ordination they are Judges of the Persons Qualifications, whether he be such as *Christ*'s Laws admit into his Ministry, and they solemnly invest him in the Office.

Princes and Rulers may, for Order's Sake, distribute their Christian Kingdoms into Parishes, which shall be the ordinary Bounds of particular Churches, and such Distribution is very congruous to the Ends of the Ministry and Churches, and conduceth to orderly Settlement and Peace.

Princes by their Laws, or Pastors by Consent, where Princes leave it to them, may so associate many particular Churches for orderly Correspondence and Concord, and appoint such Times and Places for Synods, and such Orders in them, as are agreeable to God's aforesaid general Laws, of doing all in Love to Edification and Order.

When Pastors by Concord, or Magistrates by Laws, have settled lawful Circumstances, or Accidents of Church Order, or Worship, or Discipline, though they be in particular but Human Institutions, it is sinful Disobedience to violate them without Necessity. *e.g.* Parochical Order, Associations, Times, Places, Ministers, Scripture-Translations, *&c.*

Pastors in a Synod are still Rectors of their Flocks, and their Canons to them may be more authoritative than a single Pastor's Words. 2. God's Law bindeth us to keep Love and Concord, and the Agreements of Councils may determine of the Matter in alterable Points; and so even absent and present Bishops may, *concordiæ gratia*, be obliged by God's Law to keep such Canons as are made for Concord, and so they may be the Matter of Duty.

And lastly, *more particularly speaking to our present Case, he says*, The true Interest of each particular Christian is, his pleasing and glorifying God in his holy Union with *Christ*, and with the Church universal, and subordinately his holy Unity and Concord with Ecclesiastical and Civil Society where he liveth; *and yet more plainly*, The true Interest of a meer Nonconformist requireth him —— to live in Loyalty, Peace and Patience, and in Love and Communion with the Parochical Churches.

P. 24. *N.* 17. *p.* 25. *p.* 31. *p.* 34. *n.* 39. *p.* 49. *p.* 266. *Apol. pag.* 250. *n.* 7. *p.* 25. *n.* 11.

Mr.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Baxter's *Evidence of the Soundneſs of the Liturgy, as much as concerns every Private Chriſtian's publick Communion in Prayer and Sacraments.*

THE main Body of the Non-conforming Miniſters, as far as ever we could learn, did judge as followeth. I. That thoſe Pariſh-Churches, which had true Miniſters (not utterly incapable Perſons) were true Churches of *Chriſt*. II. That the ordinary Liturgy appointed for the publick Worſhip, was ſuch as a good Chriſtian may lawfully join in; not ſpeaking of Baptizings, Burials, *&c.* in which ſome things they thought more dubious. Nay I will tell the World a certain Truth of our Succeſs and Uſage. I preach, I write, I frequently & openly taught againſt Separation, and for the Lawfulneſs of joining with the Church in the Uſe of the Liturgy: And to rebuke Men's Extremes and Cenſures of the Epiſcopal Clergy, and for an impartial Love of all true Chriſtians, I ſharply reprove the weak Reaſonings of thoſe that are otherwiſe minded; and by this I occaſion the true Sectarians every where to ſpeak againſt me.

We take it for our Duty to preach againſt *Schiſm*, *Sedition*, and *Rebellion*, and all Principles which tend to breed or heed them; and to uſe our Opportunities and Intereſt in the People to promote their Loyalty and publick Peace. Alſo we judge it our Duty to preach thoſe plain and neceſſary Things which the Salvation of Men doth moſt depend on, and the People generally have moſt need to hear, that is, the opening to them their Baptiſmal Covenant, the Articles of the *Creed*, the *Lords Prayer*, the *Decalogue*, and the *Goſpel Precepts*. Or more briefly, the Doctrine of Faith and Repentance towards God, and of the Love of God and Man, to live ſoberly, righteouſly and godly in this World—— And not to fill the People's Heads with needleſs Controverſies or vain Jangling, or contending about Words which edify not, but ſubvert the Hearers, much leſs to perplex them with talking of the unrevealed Counſels of God, nor yet to corrupt their Minds by talking againſt our Superiors, or againſt Diſſenters behind their Backs, or by aggravating the Faults of other Men's manner of Worſhip, or talking againſt Biſhops, or Ceremonies, or Liturgy; nor by repreſenting any ſort of Chriſtians who differ from us in Points not fundamental, as odious to their Hearers.

And alſo he does fully ſhew the Unreaſonableneſs of Separation from the Church of England. I know how unable the old Separatiſts were to anſwer the many Arguments of the famous *Arthur Helderſham*, *John Pagite*, *William Bradſhaw*, *Brightman*, *John Rall*, and other old Nonconformiſts, for the Lawfulneſs of Communicating in our Pariſh-Churches, in the Sacraments and the Liturgy. I was exceedingly moved againſt Separation (truly ſo called) by conſidering how contrary it is to the Principle of Chriſtian Love. 2. How directly and certainly pernicious to the Intereſt and Cauſe of *Chriſt*, and of his Church, and the Souls of Men; and how powerful a Means it is to kill that little Love that is left in the World. 3. How plainly it proceedeth from the ſame Spirit that Perſecution doth. For though their Expreſſions be various, their Minds and Principles are ſtill the ſame; which is to vilify our Brethren, and repreſent them as odious and intolerable, and overlook that of *Chriſt*, which is amiable in them. In which, when they have agreed, as Children of the ſame Father, they differ in the way of ſerving him. One ſaith therefore, Away with him, ſilence him, impriſon him, baniſh him; The other ſaith, He is ſuch and ſuch a one, therefore away with him, have no Communion with him—— Both agree in murdering Love, and accounting their Brother unlovely and intolerable. 4. I was greatly mov'd in thinking of the State of moſt of the Churches in the World: If I travelled *Abaſſia*, *Armenia*, *Ruſſia*, or among the *Greek* Churches, I durſt not deny to hold Communion with them. When I go to God in Prayer, I dare not go in a ſeparate Capacity, but as a Mem-

Digitized by Google

Member of the Universal Church, nor would I part with my Share in the common Prayers of all the Churches for all the World; but am joined with them in Spirit, while I am corporally absent, owning all their holy Prayers, though none of their Faults or Failings in them, (having many in all my Prayers to God, which I must be farther from justifying than other Men's.) And having perused all the Foreign and Ancient Liturgies extant in *Bibliotheca Patrum*, I doubt not but our own is incomparably better than any that's there.

Of the Circumstances of Worship.

THE Adversaries of our Church (says Dr. *Saywell* in his VII. Chap. of *Evangelical and Catholick Unity*) have in nothing found greater Success in alienating the Minds of the poor People from our Communion, than by casting Abroad Prejudices amongst them about the Circumstances of Worship.

Therefore, that he may give the Reader Satisfaction in these as well as in other Matters, he sets down what Dr. *O.* and Mr. *B.* say concerning them, and begins with Dr. *O. It is meerly from a Spirit of Contention, that some call on us and others to produce express Testimony* (he means of Scripture) *or Institution for every Circumstance in the Practice of Religious Duties---- Such Things as these, are the Times and Seasons of Church Assemblies, the Order and Decency wherein all Things are to be transacted in them. ---- What special Advantages are to be made use of in Preaching*, (as Homilies, Pulpits, *&c.*) *Translations and Tunes of Psalms in singing*, (as also Organs, *&c.* to help the Voices to sing melodiously) *Continuance in publick Duties*, (how long or how short) *and the like*, (what Habit and what Gesture) *the Things themselves being Divinely institated, are capable of such general Directions in and by the Light of Nature, as may with ordinary Christian Prudence be on all Occasions applied unto the Use and Practice of the Church.* And to shew that these Words did not fall by Chance from the Doctor, you find him repeating the like. *There ought to be Societies wherein Men voluntarily joyn together for the solemn Performance of Divine Worship*; (and therefore People must not forsake the assembling themselves together, and neglect the Publick Service, on Pretence of serving God at Home) *and joynt Walking in Obediente before God*; *these Societies ought to use such Means for their own Peace and Order, as the Light of Nature directs unto*; *and where Men have a common Interest, they ought to consult in common for the due Management of it. ---- The Lord Christ in the Institution of Gospel-Churches, their State, Order, Rule and Worship, doth not require of His Disciples, that in their Observance of His Appointments they should cease to be Men, or forego the Use and Exercise of their Rational Abilities, according to the Rule of that Exercise, which is the Light of Nature. ---- There are in the Scripture, general Rules directing us in the Application of Natural Light, unto such Determination of all Circumstances in the Acts of Church Rule and Worship, as are sufficient for their Performance decently and in Order. Wherefore, as was said before, it is utterly in vain and useless, to demand express Institution of all the Circumstances belonging unto the Government, Order, Rule, and Worship of the Church*; *or for the due Improvement of Things of themselves indifferent, unto its Edification, as Occasion shall require. Nor are they capable to be otherwise stated, but as they ly in the Light of Nature and spiritual Prudence, directed by the general Rules of Scripture.* So that these Things (saith Dr. *Saywell*) are to be applied and determined by some Body; for Order and Decency can never be kept up by Chance; neither will the Vulgar Sort be kept within any Rule, unless there be some Authority to determine every one's Place and Order, and to reprove and punish those that break such Commands, as is evident in all great Concourse and Meetings of the Multitude. Who then ought to appear to rebuke and chastise the Offender, if he do not observe such Decency and Order as shall be thought meet? And since we are to take the Laws of Nature for our Guide, the common Consent of Mankind have generally agreed, That 'tis the Law of Nature, that Governours in all Societies should determine the Modes and Circumstances of all publick Affairs: And the same Light of Nature does teach, that those Circumstances are most proper to be observed, which Custom and general Usage have led me into; therefore, what is thought most honourable and expressive of the greatest Reverence amongst Men, ought with the same Parity of Reason, to be understood to signify our Devotion to God. And the imitating such customary Ways of shewing Respect, is approved by God Himself. Thus when God appeared to *Moses* in the

Bush,

Digitized by Google

Bush, God requires him to come near with all Reverence; and in Token thereof, it being the Way of approaching to great Persons in that Country, to put off his Shoes, *for the Place where thou standest is holy Ground*: But that being not now a Custom of Honour in Use amongst us; but, putting off the Hat, that we ought to do, instead thereof, when we speak to God, or appear in His House, where we ought to have all awful Thoughts; and, by our outward Behaviour testify our Honour of Him, for whose Service it is set apart.

Mr. *Baxter* (saith he) does plainly ascribe the Power of determining these Circumstances unto Governours, as fully as any Body can desire. *We suppose, that there are some Circumstances of the Minister's Work, which it belongeth to his own Office to determine of.* ---- [such as are, when to Marry, Christen, or Bury, *&c.* within Canonical Times, or when to appoint a Communion on other Days, besides those prescribed by Law, *&c.*] *But there are others which it is meet should be universally determined of, for the Concord of all Churches in the Kingdom. These the Pastors and Churches by Consent may agree in without a Law, if Kings leave it to them. And Kings (by the Advice of such as best understand Church Cases) may well by their own Laws, make such Determinations.* As for Instance, *In what Scripture Translations, what Versions and Meeters of Psalms, the Churches shall agree: Much more may they determine of the publick Maintenance of Ministers, and the Temples, and such other extrinsick Accidents. Again, it is Schism, when Men separate out of Unrulineſs of Spirit, because they will not be governed by their lawful Pastors in lawful Things, as Time, Place, Order,* &c. And yet more fully, *We flatly affirm, as well as you, That the King's Laws do bind the Mind or Soul, (or Conscience, if you will call it so) to a considerable Performance of all his lawful Commands.*

We are so tender of disobeying our Rulers, that we will do any Thing to obey and please them, except disobeying God.

So that for the Circumstances of Time, Place, Order, *&c.* lawful Pastors may prescribe them; and 'tis Unrulineſs of Spirit and Schismatical, to make that a Pretence for Separation, and not obeying them. And what a vast many Controversies and Objections will this one Principle of his put an End to, between the Church of *England* and Dissenters? For, hence it will evidently follow, all the Quarrels about Holy-Days, Lent, and other Fasting-days, must be laid aside; for there must be Times of solemn praising God, and humbling our selves by Fasting and Prayer; and these the lawful Pastors may appoint. And since they have appointed those which the Christian Church has generally observed in all Ages, there can be no Ground to Except against their Observance; and under the Title of Place, Order, *&c.* will come in all the other Usages which Dissenters take Offence at: Such as the Habit the Minister wears, whether Surplice or a Gown, or any other Badge the Church shall appoint. The Part of the Church where he officiates, so as it be where the People can hear, as Baptism at the Font, reading Morning and Evening Prayer in the Desk, and the Communion Service at the Table where that Holy Sacrament is usually administred. And Lastly, By the same Principle we must allow of the Duty of Kneeling at Prayers, and at the receiving of the Sacrament, standing up at the Creeds and Hymns, and such other Accidents of Reverence and humble Behaviour while we are in God's House: For, these in themselves are lawful, being no where prohibited by God; and therefore Rulers, who are to be obeyed in all lawful Commands, must be obeyed in these also.

And here now, let all understanding and well-meaning People, that have been misled into an Admiration of the Dissenters, consider, how grosly they have been abused and cheated by them, and how shamefully the Church of *England*, and even the Christian Church in general, have been calumniated by their Teachers, as bordering upon Superstition and Idolatry, bringing in human Inventions, by laying Impositions that were not in Scripture, when they applied these Circumstances of Worship to the particular Occasions and Conveniences of the Church. When Dr. *Owen* himself says, *Nor are they capable to be otherwise stated, but as they ly in the Light of Nature, and Spiritual Prudence directed by the general Rules of Scripture.* And speaking of Church, State, and Religious Worship, he does moreover acknowledge, where Men have a common Interest, they ought to consult in common for the due Management of it. And is it not the common Interest of the Nation, to preserve Order, Peace and Holiness amongst all the Members thereof, who must have mutual Intercourse and Communion one with another? And does it not much conduce to these Ends, when they are put to no Doubts and Scruples concerning their Religious Duties, because they find the

Digitized by Google

the ſame Order, the ſame Rules of Worſhip, the ſame Prayers and Sacraments, in whatſoever Church or Pariſh they remove unto? But what endleſs Perplexities and Difficulties would People be put upon, if they were to enter into an Examination into the Grounds and Reaſons of the Religion and Worſhip that was profeſſed in every Place whither they travel, or have Occaſion to fix their Habitations? Nay, if it were left to the Pleaſure of every Miniſter to vary and change, and do what he liſt, every Lord's Day and time of publick Aſſembly, how could they ever be ſatisfied in this Matter? So that ſince Dr. *O.* does ſay, *Where there is a common Intereſt they ought to conſult in common for the due Management of it.* It being the common Intereſt of the Nation, that the Grounds and Occaſions of all Offence and Controverſy in the Circumſtances and Order of Religious Aſſemblies ſhould be taken away. The Law of Nature and common Prudence do direct, that the Governours and Repreſentatives, Eccleſiaſtical and Civil, ſhould conſult in common about them, and agree in ſuch Circumſtances as they ſhall think in their Prudence are moſt meet. And if a minor Part in Dr. *O*'s Aſſembly, ought to be concluded, and ſit down ſatisfied with the Determination of the Major; why ought not the major Part, or the concurrent Determination of the Repreſentatives of the whole Kingdom in their reſpective Capacities, conclude the reſt alſo? And what are our Eccleſiaſtical Laws, Rubricks and Canons, which they cry out upon, but the Reſults of ſuch *common Conſultations* about the due Management of the *common Intereſt*, the Peace and Order of all Religious Aſſemblies, that Perſons may have Opportunity to ſerve God decently and in order, unto whatſoever Pariſh or Country they have Occaſion to go?

The Separatiſts would do well to conſider alſo, (ſays Dr. *Saywell*) what Danger they fall into by following *Weaver*, *Cobler*, and *Tinker*-Preachers. Dr. *O.* and Mr. *B.* two Learned Men, confeſs you are in an Error, when you call for Scripture for every Circumſtance and Mode of Worſhip. Men of Learning and Honeſty ſcorn to abuſe you ſo. They were your *Tinker*, your *Weaver*-Preachers, or Men of their Level, that filled you with ſuch Prejudices and Objections againſt the Church of *England.* For Mr. *B.* does plainly tell you, *'Tis Schiſm when Men ſeparate out of Unrulineſs of Spirit, becauſe they will not be governed by their lawful Paſtors in lawful Things, as Time, Place, Order,* &c. *or becauſe a minor Part in Elections,* he might as well have ſaid alſo, *in common Conſults about due Management of Affairs of common Intereſt,* as Dr. *O.* has it, *is overvoted by the major Part, and cannot have their Wills.* And Dr. *O.* does confeſs, *'Tis meerly from a Spirit of Contention, that ſome call on us and others to produce expreſs Teſtimony or Inſtitution* (of Scripture he means) *for every Circumſtance in the Practice of Religious Duties, which may, with ordinary Chriſtian Prudence, be on all Occaſions applied unto the Uſe and Practice of the Church.* Therefore (ſaith Dr. *Saywell*) to put an End to this Chapter, I appeal to the common Reaſon of Mankind, Whether it will not be meerly from a Spirit of *Contention*, as Dr. *O.* has it, *or Unrulineſs of Spirit*, as Mr. *B.* ſays it is, for Dr. *O.* and his Congregation, or any other Diſſenters, to oppoſe their ordinary Chriſtian Prudence, to the Prudence and Determination of Church Univerſal, and the Conſtitution of our Nation, about the Circumſtances of Religious Worſhip, and to complain of Impoſitions, becauſe their Governours apply them on all Occaſions, to prevent their being miſapplied by private Men.

P. 14. *P.* 32. *Plea for Peace.* *P.* 30. *P.* 49. *Apol.* 4. *P.* 111. *Plea for Peace.* P. 49.

Digitized by Google

The Murder of the Royal Martyr K. Ch. *I. proven to have been directly and principally occaſioned by the* Scotiſh *Covenanters, and that upon theſe following Conſiderations:*

I. FROM the avowed Principles by which that Murder was committed. II. From the Practices conſequential from their Principles. III. From the Royal Martyr's own Expreſſions. IV. From the barbarous Treatment which Loyal Subjects met with. V. From their Carriage in King *Charles* the Second's Government. VI. From their Behaviour in this Revolution. VII. and laſtly, From Conſiderations on the *Solemn League and Covenant*; Their Act of the *Weſtkirk*, and the Addreſs from the Synod of *Aberdeen*.

King *Charles* I. King of *Great-Britain, &c.* the undoubted Heir of Three Crowns, the moſt ancient Hereditary Monarch in the World, as being Lineally the 109 King of *Scotland*, being barbarouſly murdered before his Royal Palace of *Whitehall* 1649, and dying an heroick Martyr for the true, ancient and Apoſtolical Government, for the ſtanding Laws and Liberties of the Nations; even ſuch a Martyr of whom no Party in Chriſtendom can boaſt the like. I here deſire to be reſolved, Whether or no the *Scotiſh* Covenanters, were the main Inſtruments of this Murder. And in order to this, let them conſider how to anſwer theſe following Queries.

I. Whether or not is it the avowed Principle of the Presbyterian Covenanters, that Reſtraints ſhould be laid upon the King's Prerogative, Power and Perſon, which they actually practiſed, when the King was governing, not only according to his Knowledge, Conſcience and Coronation-Oath, but alſo according to the then and yet ſtanding Fundamental Laws of Church and State? For is it not their Fundamental Principle, that the King derives his Power from the People; and conſequently the People muſt be the Sovereign, and the Prince the Subject, and ſo no Wrong done to the King; becauſe the People are the *Supreme*, and the King but the *Executioner* of their Decrees. Does not the Royal Martyr in his Declaration publiſh their Poſitions in the Year 1638, thus? 1. *That the Aſſembly is independent from King and Parliament in Matters Eccleſiaſtical.* 2. *That it is lawful for Subjects to Covenant and Combine, without the King, and to enter into a Bond of mutual Defence againſt him.* 3. *That an Aſſembly may abrogate Acts of Parliament, and diſcharge their Fellow Subjects from Obedience to them, if they any way reflect upon the Buſineſs of the Church.* 4. *Their denying the King's Right of calling and diſſolving Aſſemblies, and that they may continue to ſit and act, notwithſtanding of his Majeſty's expreſs Order for their Diſſolution.*

II. As theſe were their Principles, did not their Practices naturally follow thereupon? For, who was it, could or did deſtroy the King's Power and Perſon? Whether they who did aſſiſt him or they who did reſiſt him? Whether they who were in Power, or they who wanted Power? Did they not declare, That the King made War againſt the Kirk and State? Did they not make and impoſe a *Covenant*, againſt his expreſs Proclamation? Did they not preſs the Nation to take it againſt their former Obligations, to wit, their *Allegiance* to their Prince and Canonical Obedience to their Biſhops? Did they not in their Aſſembly 1643, P. 5. *make an Act to deliver all to the* MEIKLE DEVIL (as they word it) *who refuſed to ſubſcribe the Covenant*? And did not Impriſonments, Forfeitures, and Confiſcation of Goods follow upon theſe Acts? And was it not an Act in the General Aſſembly 1648, That all young Students ſhould take the *Covenant* at their firſt Entry into the Colleges, and all Perſons at their firſt receiving of the Sacrament?

III. Who ſhould underſtand the barbarous Uſings the Royal Martyr met with, better than he himſelf? And whom doth he mean when he expreſſes himſelf thus, at *Uxbridge* Treaty: *It was a grand Maxim with them, always to ask ſomething, which in Reaſon and Honour, could not be granted, that they might have ſome colour to refuſe all that was in other things granted.*

For after they ſeized upon his Forts and Revenues, and deprived him of his Children and Servants, and at laſt of Liberty to his Perſon, did this ſatisfy them, except he ſacrificed his Conſcience to their arbitrary Tyranny? And when they could not perſwade him to deſtroy himſelf, did they not put him into the Sectarian Hands, who ſoon offered up that Bloody Sacrifice, which the Presbyterians tied and bound with their Covenant-Cords?

Whom does the Royal Martyr mean when he ſays, *They think they cannot ſet up Chriſt's Kingdom, unleſs they pull down mine.*

And is it not very plain, when he ſays, *That Presbytry, like a young Heir, thinks the Father lives too long, and is impatient to be in the Biſhop's Chair, tho' Lay-Men go away with the Revenues.*

IV. Was not the barbarous and tyrannical Treatment, which the Loyal Subjects met with, a Demonſtration, that the *Scotiſh* Covenanters, were the direct and principal Inſtruments of the King's Murder? Who were loaden with the odious Names of Malignants by the Covenanters, but the King's faſt Friends and Adherents? Who did proſecute the Marquiſs of *Montroſe*, the principal Inſtrument who appeared for the King, and that with the odious Titles of *Viperous Brood of Satan, Child of the Devil, excommunicate Traitor?* Were not theſe the *Scotiſh* Covenanters in their Acts of their General Aſſembly? Or who cauſed execute him diſgracefully with the Hiſtory of his own Adventures, and the King's Commiſſion, about his Neck? Or who made the King's Loyal Subjects, do penance in Sackcloth, for their being at the unlawful Engagement, as they called it? What Difference is there betwixt ſhooting at him in a Field of Battle, and the cutting off his Head on a Scaffold? or to make his Perſon the Butt of a Cannon-Ball in a Camp, or his Neck the But of an Ax on a Block? Or if a Man travel through a Wood, and there be tied to a Tree by Robbers, and if a Wolf tear him in Pieces, who is to be blamed? the Wolf or the Robbers? Do not the Independents reply very pertinently to the Presbyterians, objecting the Murder to them, and the other Sectarians, when they ſay, *We took off but* Charles Stewart's *Head, but you took off the King's Head?* Or did not *Oliver Cromwell* ſay juſtly, *That any Indignation which the Presbyterians ſhew againſt Action was, becauſe they themſelves were not the Actors?*

V. Does not the Behaviour of the Covenanters in K. *Ch.* II's Time, by ſeveral Inſurrections, and Two Rebellions, particularly at *Pentland Hills* and *Bothwel-Bridge*, make it evident to the World, that theſe then who acted conſequentially to the Covenant, intended to ſend the Son the very Way they ſent the Father before? And was not Mr. *Cargil's* Excommunication of the King and Royal Family, truly and really founded upon that Covenant? Was it not by that Excommunication, that ſeveral poor Creedleſs-Lord's-Prayerleſs Things, were brought to Execution; and would not ſave their Lives by ſaying, *God ſave the King*? And is not the Myſtery of that Iniquity found out to be the Reaſon, why theſe deluded Things ſuffered for that Refuſal; becauſe the King was excommunicate for Breach of the *Solem League and Covenant?*

Is there a greater Diſcovery of *Scotiſh* Presbyterians mortal Hatred againſt the Royal Family, than in

Google

to condemn that damnable Action: Did they not admit a bloody Covenanter, and a violent Remonſtrator, Mr. *Hugh Kennedy* by Name, who was excommunicated, in the former Days of Presbytry, by themſelves, as a *Firebrand from Hell*, and was ſaid to have got his Share of that Money which was the Price of the *Royal Martyr*'s Blood? Did not (I ſay) they admit him Moderator to the firſt General Aſſembly which did ſit in this Revolution?

Again, Did not the Kirk ſend Mr. *Alexander Shields*, the Author of *The Hind let looſe*, to St. *Andrew*'s, where the firſt Univerſity of the Nation is, and where he had Occaſion to corrupt Youth with his *Hind-let-looſe*-Principles and Preachings: In which Book, he diſcovers the Spirit of the Party, by his vehement defending the Act of Juſtice againſt the *Royal Martyr*, and the Arch-biſhop of St. *Andrew*'s?

Withal, In this Revolution, were they ever heard in their Solemn Humiliations, or in their Diſcourſes at ſuch Communions as they can give, cry out againſt this Murder? But often did they cry out of the *Breach of the Solemn League and Covenant*: And ſtill againſt the Biſhops and *Book of Common Prayer*. Are they not heard ſtill praying, That God may renew their Covenanted Days? And are not the moſt Zealous of them in the greateſt Vogue, for baptizing in the Terms of that Covenant; and will not give their Sacrament, but to ſuch as renew their Obligations to that curſed Oath?

But further, When not very long ſince, ſome of their Ring-leaders at *Edinburgh* had the Confidence to write and print ſuch a Book as the *Portraiture of K. Ch. I.* with moſt ſcandalous Reflections upon his Royal Anceſtors, his Predeceſſors and all the Family; Can any Thing more naturally follow, than that the Covenanters are Heart-Murderers of the Royal Race? And can there be any Heart-Covenanter, but is well pleaſed with the curſed Ceremony of the *Calf-Head-Club*, which is the helliſh Sacrament and Symbol of what is ſignified by that Bloody Covenant?

Yea, can it not be proven, that ſome of their beſt Profeſſors in Divinity, have recommended to the Youth the reading of *Samuel Rutherford*'s Letters, and the *Hind-let-looſe*, as a good Foundation for their Piety and Politicks?

But to give another undeniable Inſtance, of the hot Zeal and indefatigable Endeavours of reviving and renewing their bleſt Covenant, by which the Royal Martyr was murthered, take it from M. *W. F.'s Sum of the Epiſcopal Controverſy*, printed about half a Year ago at *Edinburgh*, Page 3 of his Preface, where he ſays, That the Holy Ghoſt had a *particular View to* Scotland, (with an Emphaſis) *Reforming* Scotland, when he ſays by *Iſa:* 55. Ch. 3. *I will make an everlaſting Covenant with you*, &c. and P. 4. *We are certainly to be numbred among thoſe Iſlanders of whom the Holy Ghoſt ſaid, That they ſhould wait for Chriſt's Law, living in the uttermoſt Part of the Earth, that were promiſed to Chriſt for his Poſſeſſion*, &c. *For till of late* Scotland *was reckoned one of the outmoſt Parts of the Earth.* O horrid Blaſphemy, that a *Rebellious*, ſchiſmatical, bloody and unnatural Covenant, ſhould be foretold as a Goſpel Bleſſing! Whereas the *Antichriſt*, the *Man of Sin* and *the Beaſt*, never did more Miſchief to the Goſpel, nor brought greater Reproach upon Religion, than it did. For then was there not a Spirit of *raving Enthuſiaſm*, *Giddineſs*, *Malice*, *Murder*, and of all Kinds of Deviliſh Sins centered into the Heart and Incorporation of Covenanters? Was there not a deaf Ear given to what the *Spirit ſaid to the Churches*? And was not then the Spirit of the *Gnoſticks*, *Montaniſts*, *Manichees*, &c. and all the old Hereſies riſen again in theſe Covenanted Days? Were not the *Belief*, *Lord's Prayer* and *Ten Commandments* written upon the Walls of the Churches, blotted out, and the Antichriſtian Covenant ſet up in their Places, and that with Scriptures for Proof about it, where the Word *Covenant* was mentioned for God, purpoſely to cheat the People into a Belief, that it was the *Solemn League* was meant by theſe Scriptures.

And now having made Mention of the *Antichriſt*, *Man of Sin*, and of *the Beaſt*, it is to be obſerved that there are various Opinions thereanent, ſome making him to be *Simon Magus*; others, *Caius Caligula*, others the Pope of *Rome*; and others *Mahomet*. But there is another Opinion, tho' not common yet very ancient, and that is of *Hippolytus* Biſhop and Martyr, *de Antichriſto*, who lived in the 228 Year of God, in the Age of Miracles and Martyrdom; and his is, that the *Devil* is the *Antichriſt*. This certainly is as true and reaſonable as any other on the Head. For as *Chriſt* came to deſtroy the Kingdom of Satan, it is Satan's Buſineſs to deſtroy *Chriſt*'s, if he can; and that by the Power and Policy of Factors and Agents, cloathed in Human Fleſh. He is called, *The God of this World*, and he is ſaid to *rule in the Children of Diſobedience*, whether among *Jews*, *Heathens* or *Chriſtians*: And wherever the Goſpel Spirit is poiſoned, whether among Proteſtants or Papiſts, by *Perfidiouſneſs*, *Perjury* or *Perſecution*; there the Devil the chief Antichriſt has got Footing.

Now to apply this to the *Scots* Covenanters, was there a more *Antichriſtian* or *Mahumetan* Spirit, than was in their Days, propagating their *Covenant*, with *Fire*, *Sword* and *Deſolation*, *Rebellion* and *Schiſm*, &c. Chriſt made his Diſciples *Fiſhers* of Men; but not Butchers of them, far leſs gave he Command to murder *his Anointed or his Prophets*.

And for the *Man of Sin*, 2 *Theſſ.* 2 Ch. 3. 4. one Character of him is, That *he exalteth himſelf above all that is called God*. In Scripture Stile *Kings* are called *Gods on Earth*. And did they not by their Covenant exalt themſelves above the Royal Martyr, an *earthly God but an heavenly Man*? And would they not at the ſame Rate bring all Kings in the World under their covenanted Scepter?

When it is ſaid, That *he ſits in the Temple of God*, this may be meant of the Chriſtian Church: For a Kirk or material Temple, in the *New Teſtament* Stile, is never called a Temple. St. *Paul* calls the Church of *Corinth* the *Temple of God*; ſo may not the Antichriſt be in the Chriſtian Church as well as among the *Jews* and *Pagans*?

And for the Beaſt, 13 *Rev.* 18. *Here is Wiſdom, let him that hath Underſtanding count the Number of the Beaſt, for it is the Number of a Man, and his Number is, Six Hundred, Threeſcore and Six.* That is, here is Exerciſe for Men's Sagacity, to find out the Number of the *Beaſt*. And this will be found in the Initial Letters of every Word of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, laying aſide the Preface and the Concluſion.

It conſiſts of Six Articles, and let Men try when they will, they'll find 131 are in the Firſt: 93 in the 2d. 88 in the 3d. 99 in the 4th. 83 in the 5th, and 172 in the 6th. In all 666 the Number of the Beaſt.

The Six Articles of the Solemn League and Covenant:

I. THat we ſhall ſincerely, really and conſtantly through the Grace of God, endeavour in our ſeveral Places and Callings, the preſervation of the Reformed Religion in the Church of *Scotland* in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government, againſt our common Enemies; The Reformation of Religion in the Kingdoms of *England* and *Ireland*, in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government, according to the Word of God, and the Example of the beſt Reformed Churches; And ſhall endeavour to bring the Churches of God in the three Kingdoms, to the neareſt conjunction and

Digitized by Google

Uni-

Uniformity in Religion, Confeſſion of Faith, Form of Church-Government, Directory for Worſhip and Catechizing; That we and our Poſterity after us, may, as Brethren, live in Faith and Love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midſt of us.

2. That we ſhall in like manner, without reſpect of Perſons, endeavour the Extirpation of Popery, Prelacy (that is, Church-Government by Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, their Chancellours and Commiſſaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Arch-Deacons, and all other Eccleſiaſtical Officers depending on that Hierarchy) Superſtition Hereſy, Schiſm, Prophaneneſs, and whatſoever ſhall be found to be contrary to ſound Doctrine, and the Power of Godlineſs; Leſt we partake in other Mens Sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their Plagues; And that the Lord may be one, and his Name one in the three Kingdoms.

3. We ſhall with the ſame Sincerity, reality and conſtancy, in our ſeveral Vocations, endeavour with our Eſtates and Lives mutually to preſerve the Rights and Priviledges of the Parliaments, and the Liberties of the Kingdoms; And to preſerve and defend the Kings Majeſty's Perſon and Authority, in the Preſervation and Defence of the true Religion, and Liberties of the Kingdoms; That the World may bear Witneſs with our Conſciences of our Loyalty, and that we have no thoughts or intentions to diminiſh his Majeſty's juſt Power and Greatneſs.

4. We ſhall alſo with all faithfulneſs endeavour the diſcovery of all ſuch as have been, or ſhall be Incendiaries, Malignants, or evil Inſtruments, by hindering the Reformation of Religion, dividing the King from his People, or one of the Kingdoms from another, or making any Faction, or Parties amongſt the People contrary to this League and Covenant, That they may be brought to publick Trial, and receive condign Puniſhment, as the degree of their Offences ſhall require or deſerve, or the ſupream Judicatories of both Kingdoms reſpectively, or others having Power from them for that effect, ſhall judge convenient.

5. And whereas the happineſs of a bleſſed Peace between theſe Kingdoms, denied in former Times to our Progenitors, is by the good Providence of God granted unto us, and hath been lately concluded, and ſettled by both Parliaments, We ſhall each one of us, according to our Place and Intereſt, endeavour that they may remain conjoyned in a firm Peace and Union to all Poſterity: And that Juſtice may be done upon the wilful Oppoſers thereof, in manner expreſſed in the precedent Article.

6. We ſhall alſo according to our places and Callings in this common Cauſe of Religion, Liberty, and Peace of the Kingdoms, aſſiſt and defend all thoſe that enter into this League and Covenant, in the maintaining and purſuing thereof; And ſhall not ſuffer our ſelves directly or indirectly by whatſoever Combination, Perſuaſion or Terrour, to be divided and withdrawn from this bleſſed Union and Conjunction, whether to make Defection to the contrary part, or to give our ſelves to a deteſtable Indifferency, or Neutrality in this Cauſe, which ſo much concerneth the Glory of God, the Good of the Kingdoms, and Honour of the King: But ſhall all the Days of our Lives zealouſly and conſtantly continue therein, againſt all Oppoſition, and promote the ſame according to our Power, againſt all Lets and Impediments whatſoever; And, what we are not able our ſelves to ſuppreſs or overcome, we ſhall reveal and make known, that it may be timely prevented or removed: All which we ſhall do in the ſight of God.

QUERIES to the COVENANTERS.

I. THey who pretend, that they neither ought nor did any thing, but what they could warrant from Scripture, which Rule the *Anabaptiſts* improve againſt Infant Baptiſm, and the *Sweet-Singers*, (another Generation ſprung from the Covenanted *Cameronians*) did improve to the Tearing out of Chapters, Verſes, and to the Contents in the Bible, againſt Singing of *Pſalms* in Metre with the Common Tunes, or calling the Days of the Week after Heathen Names: Pray, what Scripture had the *Covenanters* to make and force a violent *League* againſt their Superiors in Church and State, and for overturning the Fundamental Laws of both; and to bring in a Kirk-Government which was never heard of in the Chriſtian World? And to Swear the Extirpation of Prelacie, which the Chriſtian Church never wanted? What Scripture had they to make the Subjects Sovereign, and the Sovereign Subject?

II. Can theſe Scriptures which they urge, plead for the *Covenanters* without doing manifeſt Violence to the Texts, 2 *Kings* 23. 9. 2 *Chron.* 15. 8. 9. 2 *Chron.* 30 *&c?* For were not theſe Covenants and Reformations carried on by Prince and People, and not by the People againſt the Will of their Princes?

III: How did the Covenanters win over theſe plain Scriptures, *That* David's *Heart ſmote him, for cutting a Lap of* Saul's *Garment. Fear God and Honour the King: Curſe not the King in thy Heart: I counſel thee to keep the King's commandment. He that reſiſteth receiveth to himſelf Damnation*, &c. and many other Scriptures to that purpoſe? Did they not make their Gloſs deſtroy all theſe Texts? and the meaning of them to be, *Curſe the King in Thought, Word and Deed. I counſel thee*, not *to keep the King's commandment. He that reſiſteth* not, *receiveth to himſelf Damnation* &c?

IV. How can they ſay, of all Ranks and Degrees of People, that they took the Covenant after ſerious Examination of their Conſciences, whereas the hundred Part that took it, could not examine the matter that was Sworn, nor underſtand the Fundamentals of Religion? Yea were not many forced againſt their Conſciences; under pain of Forfeitures and Excommunications to take it?

V. What Difference is there betwixt the *Popiſh Rebellion* in *Ireland*, and the *Covenanters Rebellion* in *Scotland*? Is it not all one to Epiſcopal Proteſtants, whether they be murthered by a Pope with his Council, or by a General Aſſembly with it's Covenant?

VI. What was the Effect of this Covenant? Was not the beſt of Princes murdered? Did not a bloody Uſurper tyrannize over us? When the ſacred Order of Biſhops was ſworn againſt, by this Helliſh *Covenant*, and at laſt laid aſide, what did follow? Did not *Hell break looſe*? Did not the Locuſts thereof overſpread the Earth? Did not a Deluge and Sink of Hereſies break forth? And was not the Chriſtian Religion cruſhed in it's Principles and Morals? *Edward's Gangræna*, and *Pogit's Hereſiograph* make out this to a Demonſtration.

VII. But as this *League* was Unchriſtian and Illegal, was it not alſo moſt Unnatural? For in the *4th Article*, Was not every one that Swore that Oath obliged to diſcover and delate ſuch as were of a contrary mind, and could not be ſatisfied in Conſcience of the Lawfulneſs of it; ſo that it behoved every ſuch Man either to diſſemble, or take his Hazard of extreme Miſery? By this Article was not the Son obliged to inform againſt the Father, the Maſters againſt their Scholars? Yea were not Chaplains forc'd in upon ſome Families to be Spies and Intelligencers, to the Kirk? So then did not the Words of St. *Paul* exactly come to paſs. 2 *Tim.* 3. That Men were, *Traitors, falſe Accuſers, Heady, high minded, without natural Affection, unthankful and unholy?*

Digitized by Google

To his Grace his Majesty's High Commissioner and the High Court of Parliament, The humble Address of the Synod of *Aberdeen*.

THE various Dispensations wherewith the righteous and wise Lord of Heaven and Earth hath been exercising us these many Years bygone, cries loud to all the Subjects in *Scotland*, who have not laid aside all Sense of Sin and Duty, to reflect seriously upon the publick Transactions of this Church and Nation, especially upon the Deportment thereof to the KING and the Royal Authority: And while the Lord is pleased to fix such Thoughts upon our Spirits, we cannot, unless we would blindfold our own Consciences, stop the Mouth thereof, hide our Sin in our Bosom with *Adam*, and keep fast Deceit under our Tongue, but give Glory to God in an humble and ingenuous Confession, as of the National Guiltiness of *Scotland*, so of our own Iniquity, in so far as we have been any Way accessory to these sinful and rebellious Affronts and Wrongs which have been put upon Royal Authority, whether during the Reign of our late most gracious Sovereign, that blessed Martyr CHARLES the I, or since his horrid Murder, to our Gracious King, who now in the Lord's most wonderful and gracious Providence, reigns over us, and particularly we acknowledge these sad and grievous Sins to be lying on the Land, and upon us, according to the several Degrees and Measures of our Accession, whether driven thereto by Force and Violence of a prevailing Party, through humane Weakness in that Hour of Temptation, or by sinful Silence and Want of Courage to have pleaded against such Courses, *viz.* the rising in Arms against the King, the preaching up the Lawfulness of defensive Arms by Subjects against the Supreme Magistrate which is contrary to Scripture, to all sound Antiquity, to the constant Practice of the ancient primitive Church, to the Judgment of all sound Orthodox Divines, contrary to our National Confession of Faith, and to the Oath of Allegiance, popular Reformation without, much more against the King's special Consent and Authority: The assisting the King's Enemies by joining our Forces with them, while as they were in Rebellion against their *Sovereign Lord and Master*, the preaching down the King's Cause and Interest, and preaching up the Interest of his Enemies; the giving out a Paper, called, *A seasonable Warning for delivering up the King* at *Newcastle*, and that without any Assurances either by Writ or Pledges for his Majesty's Security, Safety, Honour and Freedom, although there was no sufficient Hostage in that Land to have been given for his sacred Person: The preaching against the intended Relief of his Majesty of precious Memory, when he was suffering Prisoner in the Isle of *Wight*, *Anno* 1648, where he was detained, till at last these Usurpers brought him to that fatal Block. The putting unjust Limitations and Restrictions upon our gracious King, who now reigns over us by God's Blessing (in despight of all open and vailed Enemies, who of late have put on the Robe of Loyalty) before he was admitted to the Exercise of his Royal Power: The Indignities which were put upon his sacred Majesty, by a factious and treacherous Party in that infamous & treasonable Remonstrance: The opposing of the publick Resolutions, both of King, Church & State by that Party for the just & necessary Defence of King, Religion, Honour, Country & all which was dear to Men or Christians, the Land being invaded, & one Half thereof being possess'd by an Army of Sectaries, who by Force & Fraud had inslaved their own native Country, that ancient and famous Kingdom of *England*: And although these Sins of the Remonstrance, opposing of, and protesting against the publick Resolutions, be not a National Guiltiness, both the one and the other being testified against and condemned by the Generality of the State, Church and Country: Yet these being the Guiltiness of a Party in the Nation, we could not omit them as Matters of just Provocation against God Almighty: The excluding of the King's Interest out of the State of the Quarrel betwixt his Majesty's own Army, and that Usurper and Tyrant, *Oliver Cromwel*, by that infamous *Act of the West Kirk*: The forcing of the King's Majesty, being then in their Power rather as a noble Prisoner than a free King, sore against his Royal Will to subscribe Declarations against himself and his Royal Family: The little Sympathy with his Majesty in his Sufferings abroad: The sinful Neglect of Duty for Fear of Men in not praying for him in publick, sinful Silence in not preaching absolutely against the Usurpers, too much at least passive Compliance with them, sitting down like *Issachar* under the Burden, and being like *Ephraim* a silly Dove without a Heart. For these, and Sins of the like Nature done against the Royal Authority, God in His Justice and Wisdom, brought and keeped us long under a sad Captivity and Bondage. And have not all the Land and we, according to the Measure of our Accession more nor Reason to confess Guiltiness before God, Men and Angels, and to intreat earnestly for Mercy therefore at the Throne of Grace? And now since it hath pleased the Eternal God, by whom Kings reign, to bring back our native, and to settle him upon his Royal Ancestors Throne, for which we shall desire to bless the Lord while we live. We conceive that upon this signal Mercy God calls us to engage, likeas hereby we do in the Strength of God engage our selves never to be accessory to any disloyal Principle or Practice, but declare our utter Abhorence thereof, and of every thing that may have any Tendency that Way, obliging not only our selves to Subjection, Obedience and Submission to the Royal Authority and Commands, but also to preach Loyalty, Subjection, Obedience and Submission, and to press the samen from the Word of God and according thereto, upon all his Majesty's Subjects under our Ministry. And that it is sinful and ungodly for Subjects to resist the King's Authority, but incase of Dissatisfaction in any thing commanded by his Majesty, it is their Duty to suffer: And because it hath pleased the King's Majesty and his High Court of Parliament, for the over-reaching of several Ministers in *Scotland*, their out-stretching of *Presbyterial Government* by making it run in an excentrick Line in meddling with civil Concernments and toping with the Supreme Authority, and upon other grave Considerations, known to themselves, which becomes us not to search into, to take away and rescind the Laws and Acts of Parliament whereby the Government of this Church had any Civil Authority. That it would please the King's Commissioner's Grace, and the High Court of Parliament to join with us in this our earnest Petition, and to transmit the samen to his sacred Majesty, That he will allow us to be still under his Majesty's Protection; and that he may be pleased in his Wisdom and Goodness, to settle the Government of this rent Church, according to the Word of God, the Practice of the ancient primitive Church in such Way as may be most consistent with Royal Authority, may conduce most for Godliness, for Unity, Peace and Order, for a learned, godly, peaceable, loyal Ministry, and most apt to preserve the Peace of the Three Nations: For doing whereof, we shall be earnest to supplicate God in his Majesty's Behalf for Wisdom, Counsel and Direction. We have conceived this Emission to be a Duty lying upon us, in Reference to God, to the King, to this Church and Land, and for the Exoneration of our own Consciences before the World. And although this has been our principal Motives, yet it hath been no small Encouragement to this Synod, that we have been put in Remembrance by that noble and worthy Lord the Earl of *Marshal* in his Letter to the Assembly to this Effect; and for which the Synod renders his Lordship hearty Thanks, considering that he having so great Influence in this Corner of the Land, may be very instrumental for advancing Religion, Justice and Loyalty here. And this Paper we have ordained to be registred in our Synod Books *ad futuram rei memoriam*: And in Testimony of our Unanimity therein. We have all subscribed it with our Hands at the King's College at *Aberdeen*, the 18th of *April* 1661 Years *Mr.* Alexander Ross *Minister of* Monimusk *and Moderator*, &c. &c. &c.

West-Kirk, the 13 Day of *August* 1650.

THE Commission of the General Assembly, considering, That there may be just Ground of *stumbling* from the King's Majesty's *refusing to subscribe* and *emit* the Declaration offered unto him by the Committee of Estates, and Commissioners of the General Assembly, concerning his former Carriage and Resolutions for the Future, in Reference to the *Cause of God*, and the *Enemies and Friends* thereof; Doth therefore declare, That this Kirk and Kingdom do not own nor espouse any *Malignant Party* or *Quarrel* or *Interest*, But that they fight meerly upon their *former Grounds and Principles*, and in Defence of the *Cause of God* and of the *Kingdom*, as they have done these 12 Years past: And therefore, as they do disclaim all the Sin and Guilt of the *King and of his House*, so they will not own *him*, nor his *Interest*, otherwise than with a Subordination to God, and so far as he *owns* and *prosecutes* the *Cause of God*, and *disclaims his* and *his Father's Opposition* to the *Work of God*, and to *the Covenant*, and likewise all the Enemies thereof; And that they will with convenient Speed take in *Consideration* the *Papers* lately sent unto them from *OLIVER CROMWEL*, and *vindicate themselves* from the *Falshoods* contained therein, especially in those Things, wherein the Quarrel betwixt us and that Party is mis-stated, as if *we owned the late King's Pro-*

QUERIES *upon the Antiquity and Lawfulneſs of keeping* Chriſtmaſs, *and other Holy-Days.*

I. IT being acknowledged by the Learn'deſt Oppoſers of Anniverſary Holy Days, That *Chriſtmaſs* was obſerved in the Fourth Century, but denied that it was heard of, in the firſt Three, it is *demanded*, How it came to be ſo univerſal in the Church, and treated of by the Biſhops and Writers of the 4th Century in *Europe*, *Aſia* and *Africk*; if there was nothing of it in the 3d Century? And how came it to obſerved without the Authority of a General Council; if it had not been the univerſal Practice of the former Centuries? *Or*, How was it a new Thing in St. *Auguſtin*'s Days, when he himſelf calls it primitive? And St. *Auguſtin*, *de Baptiſmo*, laying down this rational Rule, "Whatſoever Things are not written, but by "Tradition, obſerved through the whole World, muſt be thought to have been pre-"ſcribed by the Apoſtles themſelves; or to have been ordained by General Councils, "whoſe Authority hath been ſtill great in the Church.

And in his Epiſtle 118, 119. *ad Januar.* he mentions the *Paſſion*, *Aſcenſion*, &c. and tells, That it is moſt inſolent Madneſs, to debate, what the univerſal Church did obſerve: And he makes it a Character of a true Son of the Church, to be obſervant of her Cuſtoms, and obedient to her Laws.

II. If the great Lights of the 4th Century, St. *Auguſtin*, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Chryſoſtom* and *Epiphanius*, who lived in *Europe*, *Aſia* and *Africk*, were wrong, pray who were right? Was it ſuch a Fellow as *Aerius*, whom *Epiphanius* calls a Plague to the World, a Brain-ſick Fellow, full of himſelf, and exalted in his own Fancy, who, denying any Uſe of Faſts and Feſtivals in the Church, as being *Jewiſh*, and an Encroachment on Chriſtian Liberty, would drink Drunk in the Time of *Lent*? What is the Character which *Epiphanius* paſſes on him? *Let the World judge, whether be the greater Fool*, Aerius *a ſilly Fellow of Yeſterday, ſtill living with us; or we, who obſerve the ſevere Diſcipline which our Forefathers delivered to us, and which they received from theirs, and ſo upward to the Apoſtles.*

III. Now, as is ſaid, if the Obſervation of *Chriſtmaſs* was in the 4th Century, according to the Fathers in *Europe*, *Aſia*, and *Africk*, may it not be reaſonably concluded, That it was in the Third Century? And if it was in the Third, why not in the Second? But it is not clear, that it was in the Third, at leaſt before Kings turned *nurſing Fathers, and Queens nurſing Mothers*; when the Storm and Plague of Perſecution was raging againſt Chriſtians for their Profeſſion, and their Chriſtian Aſſemblies; particularly when Twenty Thouſand Chriſtians were maſſacred by *Diocleſian*, who met at *Nicomedia* to celebrate the Birth-Day of *Chriſt* *? Yea, did not *Teleſephorus*, Biſhop of *Rome*, in the 127th Year of our Lord, appoint Prayers and Hymns on the Eve of this great Feſtival, being but in the Beginning of the Second Century? Is it not more than probable, yea, highly reaſonable to conclude, that *Chriſtmaſs* was in the firſt Century? Yea, alſo, that it was the 25th of *December*; there being no Controverſy about this Day, in the early and hot Times of Contention, about the keeping of *Eaſter* in the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches. * *Nicephor Hiſt. Lib.* 7. *C.* 6.

IV. Altho' we were not ſure of the Day, yet if we do the Duty of the Day, and bleſs GOD for the greateſt Mercy that ever came to the Earth, and that in a ſolemn Manner; and in Imitation of the holy Angels, who ſung their Hymn upon that Day: If we do a Duty which Scripture commands upon a Day, which the Church appoints, and has obſerved ſince the Days of the Apoſtles, as we may reaſonably infer from St. *Auguſtin*'s Rule. And does not St. *Chryſoſtom*, Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, own and condeſcend on the 25th of *December*, in his *Homilie* upon the Nativity? And that made good from the *Cenſual Tables* of *Rome*, that is, The Regiſters of all thoſe that were enrolled by the Decree of *Auguſtus*, St. *Luke* 2. 1. 2.? And does *Tertullian*, an early Writer, *Lib.* 4. *cont. Marcio. Cap.* 7. Letter *D.* ſays, that the *Roman* Regiſters of *Auguſtus* his Inrolment, were a moſt faithful Witneſs of *Chriſt*'s *Nativity*? And *Pamelius* in his Annotations on *Tertullian*, gives this Reaſon, why *Tertullian* ſo frequently mentions *Cenſus Auguſti*, becauſe the Heretick *Marcion* denied the ſecond Chapter of St. *Luke*, where our Saviour's Birth is mentioned?

V. When an *Anonymus* Engliſh Author, called, *An Enquiry into the Conſtitution, Diſcipline, Unity and Worſhip of the primitive Church*, who calls himſelf *an impartial Hand*, in that Book, ſhews a great Byaſs to the Diſſenters in *England*; yet he lets us ſee, how early *Chriſtmaſs* was obſerved, he cites one Paſſage out of *Clemens Alexandr.* Lib. 1. *Strom.* p. 249. where he reckons from the Birth of *Chriſt*, to the Death of *Commodus*,

(who

Digitized by Google

(who died upon the first of *January*) exactly One Hundred Ninety Four Years, one Month and Thirteen Days; and according to the *Julian* Account, makes his Birth to fall upon the 25th of *December*. When (I say) such an impartial Author yields so much; what may be thought of a stubborn Crew, that will resist such Evidences? Or, should the Christian Church lose all its obedient Children, and yield to these Schismaticks, whom nothing can please, except their Governours become their Slaves or Subjects?

VI. Is it probable, that the first Christians would observe the Passion-Days of their Martyrs, which they called their *Birth-Days*, and not observe the *Birth-Day* of our *Saviour*? Do we not find, that this Practice is mentioned in a Letter of the Church of *Smyrna*, to the Church of *Philomelium*, touching the Death of *Polycarp*, their Bishop, *Euseb. Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 15. printed at *Basil* 1587?

VII. If it be said, that the primitive Christians had no such Parades and Solemnities and Splendour at their Festivals; and therefore we do not follow their Example. May it not be reasonably answered, That if the Laws and Edicts of Heathen Emperors, were made against the first Christians, for keeping their Fasts and Festivals, forcing them ofttimes, to meet in Grots and Caves, and scattering their Meetings; that therefore, when Magistrates turn Christian, and give the Civil Sanction to these disturbed Solemnities, should not we keep the Holy-Days suitable to the Prosperity of the Church? Do not the Opposers of these Holy-Days, think it a far better Condition for Church-men, to have good Buildings, for worshipping GOD in a peaceable Way, in all Godliness and Honesty, and to have legal Maintenance from Kings and Queens that turn *nursing Fathers and nursing Mothers*, than to be a Burden upon a persecuted People for their Principles, as the first Christians were? Were not the Children of *Israel* in a better Condition to serve GOD, in their Plenty and Prosperity when they were in the Land of *Canaan*, than when they were under the *Pharonick* Persecution, or when they were 40 Years in the Wilderness? Were they not in a better Condition to serve GOD with a stately and magnificent Temple, than with a moveable Tent or Tabernacle? If the primitive Christians had many Inconveniencies, because of Heathen Persecutors, is it reasonable to think, that this was their Choice? or that we in happier Circumstances should imitate them, who could do no better? If we follow them in the Principles of Religion and Loyalty, which are still the same, whatever Change may come; yet are we not to prefer our own Prosperity and Peace, to their Poverty and Persecution?

VIII. And may not the same be reason'd for the *Hierarchy* & *Liturgy*, which were in the first Three Centuries, tho' not with that Splendor and Encouragement, which Christian Magistrates conferr'd upon the Clergy and the Profession in After-times?

IX. When the best reform'd Churches, not only the *English*, and *Lutheran*, but even the *Calvinists*, highly approve of the Anniversary *Fasts* and *Festivals* their Reasonableness & Usefulness, as conducing to Devotion, Knowledge in the Mysteries of our Religion, and Fundamentals of our *Creed*, Unity and Uniformity with all National Churches (as is proved by the Sentiments of the Learn'd Reformers, *Numb.*) What Insolence, Madness, and Bigotry, is it in a Handful of *Scotish* and *English* Dissenters, to divide from the Modern as well as from the Ancient Church, who look upon the Fasts and Festivals as Helps, Hedges, Ornaments and Memorials, of the Christian Principles, and Commemorations of the extraordinary Mercies of GOD; and which give occasion to Children to ask their Fathers, and for Servants to ask their Masters, and for the People to ask their Pastors in private, and to frequent the publick Ordinances, with a strong Desire to receive Instruction, and a warm Zeal to join in the Prayers and Praises of the Church? When, by the keeping of Holy-Days, the Understanding is informed in the Mystery, and the Memory refreshed with the History of the Christian Religion, and the Affections suitably stirred up to the Love of GOD, for His extraordinary Kindness and Care to the World. These Things, I say, giving Occasion to be resolved in Doubts, as it was among the *Jews* of old, *Exod.* 12. 26, 27. *And it shall come to pass, when your Children shall say unto you, What mean you by this Service? That you shall say*, &c. See *Josh.* 6. 7- 2 *Pet.* Ch. 12. 13. What a great Loss then are People at, by being deprived of those excellent Advantages, and to be left to the Conduct of giddy Enthusiasts, and schismatical Extemporizers, and to be fed with whatever they are Yearly pleased to speak against the Observation of them?

X. When these Feasts are so useful in themselves, that they are (as the Learn'd "*Hooker* observes) 1. "The outward Splendor and Dignity of our Religion. 2*dly*, "They are forcible Witnesses of ancient Truths. 3*dly*, Provocations to the Exercise

"of

Digitized by Google

" of Piety. 4ly, Shadows of our endless Felicity in Heaven. 5ly, On Earth, everla-
" sting Records, teaching (in a Manner) by the Eye whatsoever we believe.

When we are certainly informed, that it is by the *Fasts* and *Festivals*, that any Knowledge of Christianity is preserved in the *Greek* Church; and that *Calvin* professes, that it was against his Knowledge and Inclination, that these were disus'd at *Geneva*; when we are informed, that the Learn'd *Philip a Mornay*, the Lord *Duplesse*, that famous *French* Protestant, used all Endeavours to have the Use of them all restored among Protestants. Then what a miserable and sad Case are our *British* Dissenters in, who are taught to hate the Use of them, as Heathenism, *Judaism* and Popery?

XI. When by these *Feasts* and *Fasts*, the Articles of the Christian Religion are every Year explained; for Example, The *Mystery of the Three Persons of the Godhead*, on *Trinity Sunday*; The *Incarnation* and Birth of *Christ*, on *Christmass*; His *Sufferings* on the *Passion Week*; His *Resurrection*, on *Easter*; His *Ascension*, Ten Days before the *Descent* of the *Holy Ghost*, which is explain'd on *Whitsunday*. Then what a Loss are People at, who never have the Advantage of Hearing these Things? And what a sad Account must those Teachers give, who teach the People to abhor these Things as Superstition and Idolatry?

XII. If it be said, that we can commemorate the *Birth*, *Passion*, *Resurrection* and *Ascension* of *Christ*, and also the *Descent of the Holy Ghost*, every Day, & that there is no need of solemn Days for that End. May it not be reasonably ask'd, If they can do it when they please themselves, why not when the Church pleases? If they may do it every Day, why not one Day in a Solemnity, which is more prevailing and taking than a Day in common Course? May it not be truly said, that they who say, They do it every Day, do it no Day? And that many Paroches in the Kingdom never hear of such Subjects, but by the by, and never in an Unity or Order; and that not one Paroch knows how another Preaches, more than what he Prays? And that the People hear more of the Lives of ill Kings in the Old Testament, than of *Christ* our *Prophet*, *Priest* and *King*, in the New? And more talking of the Breach of the *Solemn League* and *Covenant*, than of the *Covenant of Grace*? Yea, more of a *Covenant* than of a *Creed*? More of *Predestination* than of the *common Salvation*? And may it not be pertinently demanded, What a dangerous and uncertain Thing it is, to be in the Bosom of a Kirk, which preaches and prays the Interest of a Party, instead of the Interest of the Catholick Church and the Communion of Saints? Its own particular Opinions, instead of the plain Articles of the Christian Faith?

XIII. If it be said, That this gives Scandal and Offence to the Weak. We have several Times answered, That this is Scandal taken, and not given: For, can Obedience to our lawful Governours in Church and State, in Things lawful or indifferent, be a Scandal? And, if by Offence, they mean, *grieving and provoking* those who are against Holy-Days; then, is it not reasonably answered, That the removing the Use of them, would displease Twenty Thousand Christians throughout the World, for one furly, peevish Schismatick whom it would please? But, if *giving Offence*, signifies (as truly it does most ordinarily) laying a Trap, or Snare, or Stumbling-block, before Men, or leading them into 'em, then I say, It is the Leaders, who despise the *Fasts* and *Festivals* of the Church, which call them *Jewish* and Heathnish, that lead the People into Sin, and not the true Observers of Holy-Days, that do so: For neither the *Jews* nor Heathens will keep the *Birth*, *Resurrection*, nor *Ascension*, of our Saviour. If it be a Scandal to the Ignorant and Well-meaning, ought they not to consult their Rulers? If it be a Pharisaical Scandal, who on Earth can mend them, who are resolved not to be convinced; and whom neither the Piety nor the Learning of the ancient Fathers, nor of the Learn'd Reformers, can perswade to a humble and tractable Spirit?

If it be said, That this is to make a Day holy. May it not be answered, That it is not to make a Day holy, but to do a holy Duty on a Day, which the Church has condescended upon, for Order, Decency, and most probable Antiquity: So it may be holy for its Use, as being an Accessory to the Duty; and so be called holy, because of its Relation to holy Duties?

XIV. What pitiful *Objections* are these, That the 25th of *December* could not be the Day, because the Shepherds were keeping their Flocks, 2. *Luke* 8, 9. and therefore that could not be the Winter-time; as if all Countries were alike? Might not an ignorant Athiest object against the Scripture, *That the Mustard Tree grows not so big, as that the Fowls of Heaven do build their Nests in it*; because it is not so in this Country, therefore it was not so in *Judea* where our Saviour spoke it? Or, is it not the leading People into Sin, to tell them, That the Day was conceal'd on purpose, for fear it should be idolized, as *Moses*'s Grave, was thus conceal'd? For, did not the Shepherds know

the

Digitized by Google

the Day? Did not the wise Men in the East know the Day? Did not the Angels sing their Hymn on that Day?. Was there any Fear of Idolatry by their Blessing of GOD on that Day? Or if they say, There is no Warrant in Scripture, for keeping of that Day. May it not be answered, Neither was there for the Feast of *Purim* in the old Testament; nor for the *Feast of Dedication*, which were of Human Institution; or that we can prove it as well as *Infant Baptism*, or the Change of the *Seventh* Day of the Week into the *First*? Or that they themselves practise many things, for which they have no express Scriptures; as, What Scripture have they for their occasional *Fasts* and *Festivals*, their keeping an Anniversary of *Heriot*'s Hospital, the *singing of the Common Tunes*, their *Cock-stools*, *Stools of Repentance*, the laying aside of the *Lord's Prayer*, which is contrary to Scripture Command, which is as great an Error as in the Papists, to deprive the People of the Cup? Yea, what Scripture have Separatists from Episcopacy in *England* or in *Scotland*, to lay down such a Position, and to make a Principle of it, as this, That we are to do nothing but what we have express Scripture for, when the Learn'dest of their Sectaries shew the quite contrary.

For do not the *English* Annotators, where Mr. *Pool* left off in 10 St. *John* 22. assert, That Magistrates have a Power to appoint publick Days, yea Annual Days of Thanksgivings for Mercies never to be forgotten? And does not Dr. *Owen*, a great Man among the Independents, declare in these Words, *That it is meerly from a Spirit of Contention, that some call on us and others, to produce express Testimony of Scripture, or Institution, for every Circumstance in the Practice of Religious Duties?* And will not this Principle of theirs, to wit, *That nothing is to be done, but what we have express Scripture for*, undo all the *Separatists* and *Sectaries* among themselves? For if a Presbyterian withdraw from the Episcopal Church, because it cannot produce Express Scripture, for keeping of *Christmass*, with the Practice of the universal Church, and thereby pull an Hundred Proselytes from the Church: Are the *Presbyterians* sure of these Converts, when an *Independent* may come upon them with that same Principle, and tell, That the Presbyterian Constitution is not according to Scripture; for the Primitive Churches were not subordinate, but independent? The Church of *Galatia* did not depend upon *Ephesus*, nor *Ephesus* upon *Corinth*, *&c.* And then may he not pull the Converts immediately out of the Presbyterian Kirk? In steps an Anabaptist into an Independent Congregation, where there are Infants baptized, and he tells, There is no Warrant for *Infant Baptism* in all the Scriptures; and Dipping in Waters was used instead of Sprinkling: Is not then the Anabaptist in a fair Way to pull the Converts to himself out of the Independents Congregation? Yea, is not a *Jewish* Rabbi, debating with such fickle inconstant Seekers, as fair in the Way to gain them to their Synagogues, when he tells, That the first Day of the Week has no Institution in the *New Testament*, and the *seventh* Day of the Week was never repealed? Infant Baptism was never institute, and Circumcision was never repealed? Are not then such unsettled Weather Cock-heads ready to be catched by the *Jews*, as they are by the different contending Parties among Christians?. What a dangerous Rule then is such a Principle, *That we are to do nothing in Worship but what we have express Scripture for?*

XV. When it is objected, That the keeping of *Christmass* occasions Abuses and Debaucheries, and therefore ought to be abolished: May not this be a satisfactory Answer, That Abuses do not take away the true Use; for then the Lord's Day and their own occasional Festivals should be removed? And that there will be Abuses whether the Day be kept or no; and that there are no such Abuses but that the Rulers of Church and State may correct, and the true Use retained: And that the Christian Devotions for the Day gains so much Time from Excess, in Prayers and Praises, as may leave an Impression upon the Minds of Men, and may be a Mean to bear down the Extravagancies that are committed, at least to cast the Ballance? In short, Is there not a Difference betwixt the Cure of a Physician and that of an Executioner; the one removing the Disease, and the other taking away the Life?

Let any Man consider what the Author of the *Revelation* says, *Let him that hath an Ear, hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.* And what our Saviour saith, *If he do not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen or a Publican.* And what St. *Paul* saith, 1 *Cor.* 21. Ch. 16. *If any Man seem to be contentious, we have no such Custom, neither the Churches of God.* And *Ecclesiasticus* 33. 7, 8, 9, and 12 Ver. *Why doth one Day excel another, when as all the Light of every Day in the Year is of the Sun? By the Knowledge of the Lord they were distinguished, and he altered Seasons and Feasts. Some of them hath he made high Days, and hallowed them, and some of them hath he made ordinary Days. —Some of them hath he blessed, and exalted, and some of them hath he sanctified, and set near himself: But some of them hath he cursed and brought low, and turned out of their Places.*

Digitized by Google

Of the Antiquity, Univerſality, Reaſonableneſs, and ſingular Advantages of Set Forms of Prayer, proven from the Old and New Teſtament, *and the Practice of the Chriſtian Church Ancient and Modern.*

By which it will appear, that the Practice of Extemporizing, is the Source of Ignorance, Spiritual Pride, Schiſm, Ill-Nature, and a mere Device of falſe Teachers to trick the People into a blind Obedience, and to make of their Conſciences whatever they pleaſe.

Cultus eſt a Natura, Modus a Lege, Virtus ex Gratia.

IT is a Maxim among the School-Men, *Nature teaches us to worſhip God, the Manner muſt come from a Law or poſitive Inſtitution, but Grace makes it effectual and acceptable to God.* Worſhip then conſiſting in Prayers, Praiſes, Sacraments, and reading of Scriptures, the People are concerned in this, as well as the Prieſts or Miniſters. For the People come not to the Congregation to preach; in this Part they muſt be all Ear and Heart: But they come to pray to God as well as to praiſe him. And as it is not enough, that a Precentor ſing all for the Congregation: So neither is it ſufficient, that a Miniſter pray all; or that all the People pray by a Miniſter's Heart and Mouth. The Miniſter may be unſound, and then his Prayers will be ſo, and an ignorant Congregation not underſtand it: Yea, he may be ignorant, and ſo utter Blaſphemy and Nonſenſe; as by woful Experience has been too much known in this Ille of *Britain.*

Therefore in Prayers and Praiſes, the People muſt be Heart, Ear and Tongue; in Sacraments, they muſt be Eye, Ear, and Heart. It is their Right and a Mean of their Salvation and Edification to know, how and what they ſhould pray, as well as what they ſhould ſing. And Teachers muſt be guilty of the moſt unaccountable Sacrilege that ever was committed on Earth, who deprive the People of this Right. Such Teachers are not ſent of God, who defraud them of their juſt Privilege, and make them believe that they are in the Light when they are in groſs Darkneſs.

To pretend that praying off Hand, without Conſideration or Premeditation, is praying by the Spirit, is no leſs than *a grieving of the good Spirit of God.* For as Satan is God's Ape in many things; ſo are falſe Teachers Apes of the True ones. They who now would ape or imitate the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, as *Miracles, Prophecies,* and immediate Inſpiration, Revelation or Impulſe, (which Gifts have now ceaſed) are likely to fall into ſtrange Deluſions and Errors; becauſe they have given over hearing, what the Spirit of God ſaith to the Churches.

He who would fain have the Gift of Miracles, which *Simon Magus* thought to buy with Money, is in Hazard of becoming a Diſciple of *Simon Magus* rather than of *Simon Peter.* He who would be at the Gift of Foretelling Things to come, has often become a Proſelyte to Satan, and become a falſe Prophet: And ſeverals, that pretend to Inſpiration, as the Extemporizers do, have been known to be inſpir'd by the Devil, and left to the *Bedlam* of their own wild Imaginations.

I here give a Defiance to all Extemporizers in the World to prove to me, That ever the Church of God was left, in it's Worſhip, to the extemporizing Faculty of conceived Prayers: Or to let us ſee any Age in the World, that wanted Set Forms: Or to make good that Rule, in their Directory, *That the Spirit of Prayer is given to all the Children of God in ſome Meaſure, for enabling their Hearts to conceive, and their Tongues to expreſs convenient Deſires to God.* Which if true, many honeſt, ſincere, well-meaning Perſons, are in a more dangerous Condition than Major *Weir* was in, who had this Faculty of praying off Hand.

But to prove the Lawfulneſs of Set Forms, from *Moſes* and the Prophets, from the Days of Chriſt's Humiliation, and after his Aſcenſion, and in the firſt three Centuries: Let it be noted *firſt* from the Old Teſtament, that Set Forms are preſcribed for the conſtant and occaſional Neceſſities of the *Jewiſh* Church.

The

Digitized by Google

The first Piece of solemn Worship was in a Set Form, composed by *Moses*, and sung by Turns in the Congregation, first by Men, and then by *Miriam* with the Female Sex, *Exod.* 15 1, 20, 21.

Were not the Priests, the Sons of *Aaron* enjoined a constant Set Form in blessing the People, *Numb.* 6. 23, 24, *&c*? Is not a Set Form prescribed for the Case of uncertain Murder, *Deut.* 21? and a Set Form of Confession in bringing the first Fruits to the Temple, *Deut.* 26. 3, 5, 10, 13, 15? And also for Thanksgiving, *Is.* 12. 1, 2, 3, *&c*? And of Thanksgiving to be used after Return from the Captivity, *Jer.* 33. 11? And was it not practised by *Ezra*, 3. Chap. 10, 11? Was not a Form of Prayer also prescribed in the Time of the Captivity, 1. *K.* 8. 47? And was it not practised afterwards by *Daniel* in the same Words, Chap. 9. Ver. 5. The same Form of Confession in the Name of the Church: See also 2 *Chron.* 20, 21, 29, 27, 28, and Chap. 6.

Yea, in the Time of the Prophets, who were inspired, were not Forms prescribed to be said by the Priests, upon the People's Conversion, *Joel* 2. 17? And a Form prescribed to the People upon their Conversion, *Hos.* 4. 2?

Are not the *Psalms* of *David* full of Confessions and Petitions, as well as of Praises and Thanksgivings? Now if the Extemporizers say, that they sing with the Spirit, in a Set Form, but they are obliged to pray by Infusion, and immediate Conception. I ask them, What Rule have they for that? For cannot the Spirit dictate Metre as well as Prose; and Psalms as well as Prayers? And may we not pray by the Spirit in a Set Form, as well as sing in a Set Form?

In the next place, it is sure, that our Saviour join'd with the *Jewish* Worship, which was not *ex tempore*, but precomposed; and that he composed a Prayer for his Disciples to be a Badge of their Discipleship and Relation to Himself, as *John the Baptist* taught his Disciples. It was not so much becaufe of their Ignorance, for they were at the daily Devotions of the Church; but for a Mark of Distinction from the Disciples of other Doctors. And, if it be said, That it was only prescribed as a Rule or Directory for Prayer, but not as a Prayer it self. That may be said of *John* the Baptist's Prayer also: But the *Westminster* Catechism calls it a Prayer, *and recommends it to be said in all the Prayers of the Churches.* Our Saviour on the Cross repeated the 22. *Psalm*, *My God, my God*, &c. and at the last Gasp, *Psal.* 31. 5. *Father, into thine Hand I recommend my Spirit:* And *Matth.* 26. 44. He repeats the same Words thrice.

That after the Ascension the Apostles kept the Temple-Service, as their Master did in the Days of His Humiliation, (for otherwise it had been a Stumbling Block in the Ways of the *Jews*, whose Conversion they endeavoured) is clear from *Acts* 2. 42. *Acts* 13. 2.

There is nothing more clear, than that of the *Acts* 4. 24. that the Converts prayed all *with one Accord, lifting up their Voices.* We are desired to glorify God with one Heart and one Mouth, which cannot be done without the People be acquainted with the Prayers and the Praises of the Church, *Rom.* 15. 6. The *Corinthians* are desired to be of the same Judgment, and to speak the same Words, 1 *Cor.* 1. 10, 11.

But 1 *Cor.* 11. 4, 5. contributes to put all out of Doubt, and proves, that Persons of all Sexes, join'd vocally in the Worship. For the Word *Prophesying* does not signify, in that Place, foretelling of Things to come, nor interpreting what was spoken by the Gift of Tongues, nor speaking for Edification; nor is it to be taken passively, as some would take it for hearing of a Prophecy: For then, as a learned Author says, every one that heareth a Prophecy is a Prophet; and by the same Reason, every one that heareth a Preacher, is a Preacher. Prophecy then has another Signification in the Scripture-Stile, and that signifies Singing: So 1 *Chron.* 25. the Officers, who were appointed for singing, are said to *prophesy with their Harps.* So that every Man or Woman praying or prophesying, signifies both the Sexes praying and singing; consequently a Congregation is to join vocally in Prayer as well as in singing.

Are not Heaven and Earth represented to us as Worshipping God in the same Words, *Rev.* 4. 8, 9. so *Rev.* 6. 11, 12, 13, 14? See *Rev.* 7. 10, 11. but especially *Rev.* 19. the first six Verses, where the whole Company of Heaven is said to joyn in the same Prayers and Praises: Either it is a real Vision, or spoken in Allusion to what was done to one on Earth; either of them proves, that Congregations should have their Share in the Worship.

This

Digitized by Google

This from Scripture might be very ſufficient to Men; that are not wilfully blind, or extreamly miſled by falſe Teachers. But ſtill they urge on us the Practice of the firſt three Hundred Years, that there were no ſuch thing as Set-Forms, and in this Point they will gain as little as from Scripture. For if they did not Worſhip God by Forms, with which the People was acquainted, their Worſhip was either by immediate Revelation, or by Extemporary Conception. If it was by immediate Revelation, why do not the Presbyterians follow their Example? If they ſay, that they do, then what they utter muſt be as Canonical as the *Pſalms* of *David*, or S. *Paul*'s Epiſtles. Or how come they not to Preach by immediate Inſpiration, as well as to Pray by it? Or how come they to Study their Sermons, leſt they ſpeak Nonſenſe to the People; and not their Prayers, leſt they ſpeak Nonſenſe to God? It lies at their Door to prove, that the Primitive Chriſtians worſhipped God in Publick by immediate Conceptions.

That the people worſhipped God by Prayers, with which they were acquainted, & to which they were accuſtomed, may be proven by the Names which they gave to their publick Prayers, as *Juſtin Martyr*, *Apol.* Cap. 88. calls them *Common Prayers*. *Ignatius*, *Ep. ad Magn.* calls them *Joint-Prayers*. *Origen*, *contra Celſum*, Lib. 6. calls them *Conſtitute Prayers*. S. *Cyprian*, *de lapſis*, calls them *Solemn Prayers*. Which in Propriety of Speech cannot be ſaid of Conceiv'd Prayers, which the People never heard nor knew.

For the further Probation, I begin with S. *James* the Apoſtle's Liturgy, which he truly wrote, tho' it underwent ſome Variations in After-Ages: Which is the Fate of Creeds and Liturgies, according to the Exigencies and Emergencies of Times: As the *Nicene Creed* was enlarged by reaſon of *Macedonius*'s Hereſy. Thus an Office upon the Martyrdom of King *Charles* the I. and upon the Reſtoration of King *Charles* the II. is added to our Book of Common-Prayer. So alſo the General Thankſgiving has been inſerted into the Book it ſelf, ſince the Days of King *Charles* the I.

I doubt not but the Hiſtory, that goes under *John Knox*'s name, was done by himſelf tho' things be there related ten Years after his Death, by the Publiſhers who had his Manuſcripts in Cuſtody.

The Learned *Du Pin*'s Arguments againſt S. *James*'s compoſing a Liturgy, are not half ſo ſtrong, as the Anſwers which the Learned and Pious Cardinal *Bona* gives for it.

One of *Du pin*'s Arguments is, *That the Virgin* Mary *is called the* Mother of God. *And the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are ſaid to be conſubſtantial with the Father*; *terms*, ſays he, *altogether unknown before the Councils of* Nice, Epheſus, *and* Conſtantinople.

The Anſwer is, as is ſaid before, That Additions of After-Ages do not prove, that S. *James* never wrote a Liturgy, but rather that he did write; tho' they mixed their own with his. It will not follow, ſays *Bona*, *de Reb. Lit. Cap.* 8. but *Moſes* was not the Author of the Book of *Deuteronomy*, although the laſt Chapter, which treats of his Death and Grave, was written by another Hand.

Another of *Du' Pin*'s Arguments, is, that the *Triſagion and Doxology, that is, the* Sanctus, *and the* Gloria Patri, *are in S.* James's *Liturgy, which were not generally recited till the fifth Century*: *For tho' it might be prov'd that they were in uſe before*; *yet it muſt be confeſſed that it was not the general Cuſtom of the Church.*

The Anſwer that is given to *Du' Pin*'s former Argument may ſerve this, and all the reſt of his Arguments upon this Head: Beſides, the *Triſagion*, *Holy*, *Holy*, *Holy*, is a Scripture Phraſe, *Iſa.* 6. and 3. *Rev.* 4. 8. And for the *Gloria Patri*, I ſee no Shadow of Reaſon for it, why the Words, in which the Apoſtles were daily Baptizing, might not be uſed as an Hymn.

That S. *James* made a Liturgy for the Church of *Jeruſalem*, is proven from the ſubſequent Ages that make mention of it. For S. *Cyril* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who lived in the 350 Year of God, writes a Comment upon it, in his *Catecheſ. Myſtag.* which S. *Jerom* tells, was written in his younger Year. Again *Proclus* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who lived in the 434 Year, makes mention of S. *James*'s Liturgy; and the 6th General Council of *Conſtantinople*, held in *Trullo* the Emperor's Palace in the Year 692. But that which contributes to put all beyond Doubt, is, That that great and admirable Light S. *Baſil*, Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, who lived in the 370 Year of God, is ſaid to have compendiz'd S. *James*'s Liturgy. The Reaſon given by *Bona* is, becauſe the Chriſtian Zeal in theſe Days began to cool, Men turn'd rich and lazy; and therefore to oblige their Attendance he abridg'd that Liturgy.

If

Digitized by Google

If it be objected, that what the Apoſtles dictated was by immediate Revelation; conſequently it ſhould be canonical Scripture, and no Perſon ſhould meddle with it by their After-additions.

To which it is anſwered, That St *Barnabas* was an Apoſtle; yet his Writings are not received as Canonical but as Eccleſiaſtical Scripture.

Again, if it be ſaid, That God permits not that to be loſt which came from inſpir'd Perſons.

It is anſwered, That ſeveral Books in the Old Teſtament are mention'd, ſuch as the Books of *Gad* and *Nathan*, &c. which are loſt. 2dly, The Liturgy of St. *James* is not loſt, tho' After-Ages added ſome things to it. As the laſt Chapter of *Deuteronomy* was added to the Writings of *Moſes*: And as the *Conſtantinopolitan* Creed added to the *Necene*. *Salmaſius* and other learned *French* Proteſtants did not deny, but St. *Ignatius* wrote Epiſtles; altho' they did not own, that theſe Epiſtles, that were in their Hands were genuine.

We read of the Liturgies of other Apoſtles, as St. *Peter*, and St. *Mark*, which is very probable, although After-Ages corrupted them. For we find, that Archbiſhop *Uſher*, in his Diſcourſe of the Religion profeſs'd by the Ancient *Iriſh*, ſhows, that St. *Patrick* brought a Liturgy into *Ireland*, which he received from *Germanus* and *Lupus*, Two *French* Biſhops, who came over into *Britain* in the 5th Century, to aſſiſt the Church againſt the *Pelagian* Hereſy; and that this Liturgy was taken originally from St. *Mark*. And the learned *Uſher* affirms, that he had ſeen it in an ancient Fragment, well nigh Nine Hundred Years ſince. See for this the learned Dr *Shaw* Rector of *Whalton* in *Northumberland*, in his Book called, *No Reformation of the eſtabliſhed Reformation*, Pag. 104.

Another Argument, to prove that Liturgies were in Uſe in the firſt Three Centuries, ſhall be from the Words of *Tertullian*, who lived in the End of the ſecond Century, and in the Beginning of the third, out of his Apology, where he ſhews how Chriſtians pray'd in his Time. The Words are, *Sine Monitore, quia de pectore: We pray without a Monitor, a Promptor, or a Rouſer, or one to ſtir us up to pray*, becauſe it *comes from the Heart*. Which Words, the Oppoſers of Set Forms think, make mightily for them; whereas upon the following Conſiderations, they are ſtrongly againſt them. For not to ſpeak of the Obſcurity of this Father's Stile, I ſay, that Sentence cannot make Senſe in Two Caſes. Firſt, if it be meant, that the Miniſter precompoſed a Prayer with which the People was not acquaint, and repeated it to the Congregation; then, he that pray'd was a Monitor, or a Prompter. 2dly, If it be ſaid, That the Miniſter prayed *ex tempore* or off hand, in Words which the People know not before hand, then he was a Prompter.

But in the next place, the Words will make good Senſe in four Caſes.

Firſt, If it be in Alluſion to the Cuſtom of the Heathens, which began with their Invocation of their greater Deities by Name, recited by the Prieſt, and repeated by the People after him; and that both Prieſt and People had a *Monitor* and *Cuſtos* over them, to correct them, when the one dictated and the other repeated falſly; as *Rigaltius* has it upon the ſame Words of *Tertullian*: If this, I ſay, be the Meaning, it makes good Senſe.

2dly, If the Meaning be, we pray heartily for Heathen Magiſtrates, without being forced or compelled thereto; the Words will bear that Senſe without any torturing of them: And 'tis moſt probable, that this is the Meaning; for the Words run thus, *ſine Monitore, quia de pectore oramus pro Imperatoribus vitam prolixam*. We pray for a long Life to the Emperours, and that without being compell'd thereto. Or

3dly, It is meant of every one in the Congregation going to their own ſecret Prayers, without a Prompter or Monitor; and then the Words make good Senſe. Or

Laſtly, It was a Worſhip, which the People, by daily Practice, was acquainted with, and in which they did vocally join; and this makes directly for joint and Common-Prayer. And that the People did join, is clear from another Paſſage in *Tertullian*, upon Prayer; *Our Voices muſt be low, and we muſt not ſpeak louder than is neceſſary to be heard*. Which Words import, that the People vocally join'd; as in our Book of Common-Prayer, the Exhortation runs thus, *I beſeech you, as many as are here preſent, to accompany me with a pure Heart and humble Voice*, &c.

In

Digitized by Google

In the next Place, it is very plain, that Common Prayer was uſed in the Third Century, when *Hippolytus*, Biſhop of *Porta*, who lived in the 220 Year of God, in the Age of Miracles, ſaid, That *it was a Sign of the Antichriſt's coming, when Liturgies and reading of Scriptures ſhould be turn'd out of Churches.*

And now to conclude, who would not be for a Liturgy, when, beſides the Authority of plain Scripture, Primitive Antiquity, and the Practice of all Churches in the World, the Thing it ſelf is ſo uſeful and reaſonable, that the contrary is moſt dangerous and unreaſonable? For by the Book of Common Prayer, the three Kingdoms are like one Paroch Church; all have the ſame Mouth, in Prayers and Praiſes, and the ſame Ear hearing the ſame Scriptures. Whereas, by our *Scotiſh* Way, not one Paroch knows how the other worſhips God: For if they ſay, they have but the ſame Worſhip; then, if one ſpeaks Nonſence and Blaſphemy, as Hundreds of them do, the whole extemporizing Kirk does the ſame. Is not this like an Houſe full of Fiddlers, every one playing a different Tune? Beſides they cannot ſhow their Worſhip more than Quakers, who have the very ſame Arguments for their immediate Revelation, which Presbyterians have for their extemporizing, and truly to better Purpoſe. Moreover, how can any Perſon be ſaid to join in an extemporary Prayer, and have his Mind two Ways, his Attention to hear what the Conceiver ſpeaks, and have his Heart fixt on God, in the Time that he is conſidering whether he ſhall join or not? And how can an immediate Conception bring forth but a monſtrous Birth? How can any ſubſcribe the Presbyterian Prayers, more than he can write his Name upon the Water or in the Air? Withal, may not an *Arian*, *Socinian*, yea a masked *Jew* or *Turk* pray his own Principles by conceived Prayers, and never be diſcovered? But it is not poſſible for him to pray by the Book of *Common Prayer*, and to pray his own Tenets and falſe Principles. For Antinomaniſm, we know, is both preach'd and pray'd among Presbyterians, and never cenſured; as alſo, ſeveral other heretical Points as in the Matter of Set Forms, Magiſtracy and Epiſcopacy.

To ſum up all, ſo long as *Calvin*'s Reaſons for Set Forms of Prayer laſt, ſo long there will be Uſe for a Liturgy: But ſo long as there are Ignorance and Imperfections on Earth, his Reaſons will endure. His Reaſons are,

Firſt, To help the Weakneſs of ſome: He might have added, of many Thouſands; becauſe for one knowing Perſon in a Congregation, there are Hundreds of Ignorants.

Secondly, That the Conſent of Churches may be known among themſelves. He might have ſaid, in Conformity with the Old and new Teſtament Churches, and primitive Practice. Let any, who reads the large Hiſtorical and Geographical Dictionary, or the Abridgment thereof, look the Word *Liturgy*, and he will find that there is no Church in the World that wants a Liturgy, but the Diſſenters of *England*, and the confuſed Kirk of *Scotland*, who are the very Peſts and Plague of the Iſle of *Britain*.

Thirdly, *Calvin*'s third Reaſon is, to put a Stop to the Ramblings of ſome light Heads, who affect Novelties; and of this we have woful Experience: For there is hardly a giddy Head, but takes all the wild extravagant Fancies of his Brain to be Incomes of the Holy Ghoſt. It is well known, that this popular Trick of extemporizing brought the *Royal Martyr* to the Scaffold, pull'd down the ancient Apoſtolical Government, and brought in a Swarm of Sectarians, which revived the old buried Hereſies; and in a Word brought a total Eclipſe upon the Shunſhine of the Goſpel. The Lord open the Eyes of the People, that they may ſee their Intereſt and their Duty, and that they may diſcern how much and how long they have been miſled by falſe Teachers.

Du Moulin's *Obſervation in his Hiſtory of the* Engliſh *and* Scotiſh *Preſbytery.*

IT *was* (ſaith he) *a Point of Prudence in the Covenanters to lay aſide the Liturgy, becauſe it croſs'd their politick Intentions, being to build themſelves an Empire in the Confuſion they made.* His Animadverſions follow.

1. *In the Liturgy, the King is called,* Our moſt Gracious Sovereign; *and this would give the Miniſter the Lie, who us'd to call him, a Cruel Tyrant.*

2. *By the Liturgy, Subjects were taught to pray,* God ſtrengthen the King, that he might overcome his Enemies, *which were to pray to God for the Ruin of the Holy Covenant.*

'3. In the Liturgy, God is called, *The only Ruler of Princes,* which is contrary to their Do'ctrine, That Kings are accountable to their Subjects.

'4. By it we pray, *That the King's Subjects may duly conſider whoſe Authority he hath* '(namely God's) which croſſes the Doctrine of King's having Authority from Men.

'5. There

'5. There 'tis pray'd, That the Subjects of the King, *may faithfully serve, honour, and humbly obey him*: This would utterly spoil the Affairs of the Covenanters, if the Lord should hear this Prayer.

'6. There 'tis pray'd, That the *Lord would so bless the King, that under him we may be godly and quietly govern'd*; which would spoil their Intentions of governing us, without him.

'7. It prays for *all in Authority under him*; but they must pray for all in Authority above him.

'8. There 'tis pray'd, *That God would give Peace in our Days*; but this was unsuitable to the Intention of the *Covenanters*, who preach no other Thing in Substance, than that ill apply'd Text, *Cursed is he that with-holds his Sword from shedding Blood.* And a little after, the same Author tells us, That the prophane Contempt, wherewith they us'd this *Holy Liturgy*, ought not to be imputed to the Insolencies of Soldiers, but to the Instructions which were given them, from a Book called, *The Parliament's Soldiers Catechism*, publish'd and recommended by special Authority, which taught them to tear it in Pieces wherever they found it, calling it, *A most abominable Idol.*

'He observes also, That the Authors of the *Directory* labour'd to turn the Eyes of Ignorant People, towards the Churches beyond Seas, hoping, that looking so far off, they could not know what they did; and therefore in the Preface to the Directory, they made People believe, *That by long Experience, they found that the* English *Liturgy was offensive to Foreign Reform'd Churches, and that it was to answer the Expectation of these Churches, that they rejected the ordinary Liturgy.* Upon which our Author falls upon this pathetick Exclamation. 'Oh our good GOD! These Persons, do they meddle to preach the Truth? Because that *France* and *England* are separated by Sea and Language? Do they think that their People shall never be inform'd of the Truth of the Opinion of their Neighbours, touching the *English Liturgy*? I hope they will leave to others the Practice of this Maxim, *Lie boldly, altho' you be refuted after, there will remain some Impression upon the Spirit of the Hearers.* Where is their Honesty? Where is their Sincerity? Do they hope by these wicked Ways to draw down the Blessing of God upon their Cause? The Truth which they pretend to advance, must it be set up by Lying?

'Again (saith the same Author) the Covenanters endeavoured to alienate *Foreign Churches* from the *Church of* England, upon the Outward of Religion. His Majesty remembers them, how at *the Synod of* Dort, both the Discipline and Liturgy of the *Church of* England were approv'd by Word and Writing by Eminent Divines of *Germany*, *France*, *Denmark*, *Sweden* and *Switzerland*, as appears in the Act of that *Synod*; yet notwithstanding the *Covenanters*, at this Day, are so impudently bold, as to publish, *That, by long and sad Experience, they found the* English *Liturgie* offensive to the Foreign Reform'd Churches:

Short Reasons for Set Forms *from Bishop* Taylor's *Preface to the Apology for authoriz'd Liturgies.*

1. THAT we may imitate the perpetual Practice of the Jewish and Christian Churches 2. That we may follow the Example, and obey the Precept of *Our Blessed Saviour*, who established a Set Form. 3. That all that come, may know the Nature of publick Communion, the settled Principles of their Religion, and Manner of Address to God. 4. That we may know before hand what to pray to God, and not do it by an implicite Faith of an Extemporizer. 5. That there may be Union of Hearts, Spirits and Tongues. 6. That there may be a publick Symbol of Communion, and that our united Prayers may have more Weight with God. 7. That the Ministers less Learn'd may have Provisions of Devotion made for them. 8. That the more Learn'd may have no Occasion of Boasting, and so their Prayer be turn'd into Sin. 9. That extravagant Levities and secret Impieties be prevented. 10. That the Offices Ecclesiastical may the better secure the Articles of Religion. 11. That they may edify the People by their Books of dailly Use. 12. That Men by the interveening of Authority, may be engag'd to certain Devotions. 13. That not only the Duty, but the very Form of it's Ministration, may be honoured by the Countenance of Authority, and not be expos'd Contempt by Reason of the Sufficiency of it's external Warrant. 14. To secure the Ministry from the Intrusion of Men whom God hath not sent. 15. That the Indetermination of the Office may not introduce Indifferency, nor Indifferency lead in a freer Liberty, nor Liberty degenerate into Licentiousness, or Licentiousness into Folly and Vanity, and these come some Times attended with secular Designs, lest these be cursed with the Immission of a peevish Spirit upon our Priests, and that Spirit be a Teacher of Lies, and these Lies become the Basis of impious Theorems, which are certainly attended with ungodly Lives, and then either Atheism or Antichristianism may come, according as shall happen in the Conjunction of Time, and other Circumstances; for this would be a sad Climax, a Ladder upon which are no Angels ascending or descending, because the Degrees lead to Darkness and Misery.

Digitized by Google

The *Episcopacy* of the first Three Centuries proved to be, in Substance, the same with the present *Episcopacy* which is impugn'd by the *Presbyterians*; and that their insisting against Diocesan *Bishops*, is false, ridiculous and impertinent.

THE *Scotish Presbyterian* Champions with great Confidence tell us, That there was no Distinction of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* for the first three Centuries, which is to give the Lie to the learn'dest Advocates for *Presbytery*, who wrote in *France* or any where else: Particularly *Daille*, de Script. *Dion.* & *Ignat.* falso attrib. Lib. 2. Cap. 38. who asserts that,

It is clearer than the Sun at Mid-day, from such of the Writings of Origen *as are extant, and especially from* Cyprian's *Epistles, that towards the End of the third Century, not only the Offices and Functions; but also the Names of* Bishop *and* Presbyter *were distinguished all the* Roman *World over.* The *Presbyterians* would wish, that they had no such great Primitive Lights to gain-say the Cause which they plead for. For,

Can there be any Thing more express than *Origen*'s Testimony, in his Book concerning Prayer, after he has spoken of Duties common to all Christians, he subjoins, *Besides these common and universal Debts, there is a Debt peculiar to these that are Widows, maintain'd by the Church, and there is a Debt peculiar to* Deacons, *and another peculiar to* Presbyters. *But of all these peculiar Debts, that which is due by the* Bishop *is the greatest, it is exacted by the Saviour of the whole Church; and the* Bishop *must smart severely for it, if it be not payed.* Again, in the 11th Homily on S. *Jerom*'s Prophecy, he has these following Words, *More will be required of me who was a* Presbyter, *than of a* Deacon; *more of a* Deacon *than of a* Laick: *But he has most to account for, who has Ecclesiastical Principality over us, to wit, the* Bishop.

I need not cite Authorities from S. *Cyprian*, the worthy Author of that Age having done it with that Evidence, that I think none, but a wilful Brain-sick Creature wedded to the Bigottery of a Party can deny it: For he has cited 50 of the *Presbyterian* Champions, acknowledging that S. *Cyprian* wrote for such an *Episcopacy* as we contend for.

Secondly, This Assertion of the *Scots Presbyterian* Champions, to wit, That there was no Distinction betwixt *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, in the first three Centuries, contradicts *Blondel*, who acknowledges, that *Episcopacy* began in the hundred and fifty Year of God; and that was in the Middle of the second Century. Here are the third and second Centuries ingenuously acknowledged by the learn'dest of the Party, to be *Episcopal*. But against *Blondel*, we oppose the Government of the four famous Churches, to wit, *Jerusalem*, *Rome*, *Antioch* and *Alexandria*.

1. For *Jerusalem*, Thirteen of the Circumcision succeeded to S. *James*, who was the first *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, whereof *Judas* was the last, who, according to the Calculation of some, died *Anno* 131, which is full Twenty Years before *Blondel*'s *Æra*.

2. At *Antioch*, after S. *Peter*, was *Evodius*, who lived till the 98, *Ignatius* succeeded, who lived till the 108. After him *Cornelius* who died in 140.

3. Seven successive *Bishops* sat in *Rome* till the 140.

4. At *Alexandria*, Five are accounted from S. *Mark*, the last whereof was *Eumanes*, consecrated in 134.

So that if *Daille* and *Blondel* be defeat, we need not trouble our selves much with any *British Presbyterian*, seeing they have said Nothing to so good Purpose as these.

It is impossible for the Adversaries to assign the Time, when this pretended Change betwixt *Bishop* and *Presbyter* began; the Distinction is visible about the Middle of the second Century, which was little above 50 Years after the Death of the Apostles. How then came such a sudden Change throughout *Europe*, *Asia* and *Africa*, without so much as a Meeting upon it? Or a Protestation of the Clergy against an Usurpation, or an Encroachment upon their Rights? Is this in them any Thing else but a groundless Assertion? For *Bishopricks* then, were so far from being tempting, that they were in a Manner forced upon Men of Merit, by the Clergy and the People; and frequently it exposed the *Bishops* to the most cruel Persecutions, and tormenting Deaths which Tyranny could devise.

How this sudden Change came, is a Thing no *Presbyterian* can tell, nor can determine. However some of the critical *French* Champions pretend, they have found out the exact Time of it's Rise; and that was in *Hyginus*'s Time, the Ninth Pope of *Rome*, who was a Martyr for *Christ*, and yet altered the Church Constitution; and this they collect chiefly out of the Pontifical of *Damascus*, who says, that *Hyginus composuit clerum & primus distribuit gradus.* So that according to them, this Holy Martyr began this Piece of Antichristianism, and made the first Innovation, which will be liable to a great many Difficulties. For,

First, What Influence could this have upon other Churches, to follow his Example? What Temptation had *Hyginus* to have Preheminence above his Brethren; when Martyrdom was the greatest Reward he expected for his *Episcopacy*? Yea, how will this agree with S. *Jerom*, who says, *toto orbe decretum est.* i. e. the Distinction betwixt *Bishop* and *Presbyter* was in the Days of the Apostles.

Besides, if this Distinction of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* as to the Name, Order and Office, was long before *Hyginus*, then this Assertion falls to the Ground. But *Telesephorus* to whom he succeeded

Digitized by Google

ſucceeded, ordains in his Life-Time, 8 *Deacons*, 15 *Presbyters*, and 13 *Biſhops*: So *Hyginus* ordaining 5 *Deacons*, 15 *Presbyters*, and 6 *Biſhops*, did but what his immediate Predeceſſor had done. But *Xyſtus* or *Sixtus*, who was before *Teleſephorus*, in the Year 130, according to the Calculation of ſome, who governed that Church 10 Years, ordained 4 *Biſhops*, 11 *Presbyters*, and 11 *Deacons*. Before *Xyſtus*, *Alexander*, living in the Beginning of the ſecond Century, ordained 5 *Biſhops*, 5 *Presbyters*, and 3 *Deacons*. *Evariſtus* who lived in the End of the firſt Century, before *Alexander*, ordain'd 5 *Biſhops*, 6 *Presbyters*, and 3 *Deacons*. See *Anaſtaſ. Bibl.* who lived in the Beginning of the Ninth Century. And *Platina*, Keeper of the *Vatican* Library.

It is againſt *Rome*, that the Outcry of Innovation is made; and ſee how it is vindicated in the firſt three Centuries. Go we up to the Writers of the firſt Century, what more clear than *Clem. Rom.* 1 Ep. ad *Corinth.* S. 40. where he enumerates four Orders in the Church? His Words are,

To the high Prieſt, proper Offices are committed; to Prieſts, their proper Station is aſſigned; Levites have their proper Miniſtries; and a Lay-man is bound by Laick Precepts. Let every one of you, Brethren, give Thanks to God, living conſcientiouſly, without tranſgreſſing the preſcribed Rule of his Service or Miniſtry.

Hermas, his *Shepherd*, makes three Orders, *viz. Biſhops*, *Preſbyters* and *Deacons*, in theſe Words. *Thoſe ſquared and white Stones, are the* Apoſtles, Biſhops, Doctors, *or* Teachers, Miniſters *and* Deacons.

For S. *Ignatius* is ſo plain, that the Adverſaries have no other Refuge, but to deny them to be real; although Dr. *Uſher* a *Biſhop*, and *Voſſius* a *Preſbyterian*, have, from different Libraries, preſented us with the genuine Copies; and others have vindicated them, againſt the critical Quibbles of thoſe who will not part with their baffled Opinions, for Truth and Demonſtration.

Polycarp, Biſhop of *Smyrna*, ordained thereto by the Apoſtles, in his Letter to the *Philippians* clearly diſtinguiſhes himſelf as *Biſhop*, from his *Preſbyters*, thus: Polycarp *and his* Presbyters *to the Church of God lodging at* Philippi.

I ſhall only mention *Alexandria*, which I have done in my Vindication of S. *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles; becauſe *Preſbyterians* think, that a Paſſage in St. *Jerom*, and *Eutychius*, Patriarch in *Alexandria*, in the 9th Cent. who tells us, it was a Cuſtom in that Church, for the *Preſbyters* of the Place (from St. *Mark*'s Days downward to *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius*) in the Time of a Vacancy, to chuſe one of their own Number, whom they ſtiled their *Biſhop*. To which I anſwered, That if this be true in their Senſe, it was contrary to the Practice of the univerſal Church. 2*dly*, We may take ſeveral Paſſages out of St. *Jerom*, his Letter to *Evagrius* againſt himſelf, and retort his own Queſtion upon him, Why doſt thou object the Cuſtom of one City to me? 3*dly*, He calls the *Biſhops*, the Succeſſors of the *Apoſtles*; and how could *Preſbyters* make ſuch, who were not ſo themſelves? For it can never be gathered from St. *Jerom*, that the *Preſbyters* did ordain or conſecrate the *Biſhop*; or that their ſimple Nomination was conſummative: But it was ratified by Conſecration, and *Epiſcopal* Acts of neighbouring *Biſhops*. For *Euſebius*, a *Biſhop* in *Paleſtine*, a Country divided from *Alexandria* by the Red-ſea, obſerves there no different Forms of Conſecration and Ordination from other Churches: For *Anianus* was ordained by St. *Mark*, *Euſeb*: Eccleſ. Hiſt. Lib. 2. C. 24. *Abilius* ſucceeded to *Anianus*, *Euſeb*: Lib. 3. C. 13. was ordained by St. *Luke*, by the Traditions in the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. *Cerdon* ſucceeded, *Euſeb:* Eccl. Hiſt. Lib. 3. Sec. 21. & was ordained by ſeveral *Biſhops* that went to the City for that Purpoſe, according to *Severus Alexandrinus*, cotemporary with *Eutychius*, and who wrote the Lives of the *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria*. *Primus* ſucceeded to *Cerdon*, and was conſecrated by neighbouring *Biſhops*, according to the ſame *Severus*. This *Primus* lived in the Days of *Adrian* the Emperor, who knew there were many *Biſhops* in *Egypt*, and wrote a Letter to *Severianus* the Conſul, which is inſerted in the Life of *Saturninus* by *Vopiſcus* a *Latin* Hiſtorian. This Letter was written about the Year 132; it gives a Character of the People of *Egypt*; and, by the By, the ſaid *Adrian* mentions their *Patriarchs*, *Biſhops* and *Preſbyters*. Surely this Heathen Emperor had no Deſign againſt *Preſbyterians*, or to flatter *Biſhops*, but meerly to relate Matter of Fact.

As for *Eutychius*, who lived in the tenth Century, I know not what to make of him; ſome make him learned, and others ignorant and fabulous. But I find, that *William Pryn*, in his Unbiſhopping of *Timothy* and *Titus*, p. 145. pays a great deal of Deference to his Authority, meerly upon the Account of his aſſerting the *Preſbyters* Power to elect their own *Biſhop*; though in that Letter of *Eutychius*, which Mr. *Pryn* ſets down in the forecited Place, there is a Story as fabulous like as Legends are, *to wit*, That St. *Mark*, having the Latchet of his Shoe ſlitten, he called for a Cobler *Hananias*, who is *Anianus*, and he mending St. *Mark*'s Shoe, pierced with the Awl his own Finger, whence flow'd a great deal of Blood; and murmuring in his Mind againſt St. *Mark*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, for the Miſchance that befel him, the Patriarch told him, *Fear not, believe in* Chriſt, *and thou ſhalt be well*; and, in the *Name of* Jeſus, *healed his Finger*; and ſo *Anianus* was baptized, and ordained Patriarch of *Alexandria* by St. *Mark* himſelf. This Story of *Eutychius* will paſs for Truth with the *Preſbyterians*, merely for aſſerting the coequal Power of *Preſbyters* with *Biſhops*, which I have proven not to be true.

All theſe Things are pretty plain, yet not prevailing; and no Wonder, when plain Scripture ſeems to as little Purpoſe with them; for ſure I am, that *Infant Baptiſm*, the *changing of the ſeventh Day into the firſt Day* of the Week, and Proofs for Canonical Scripture, are not ſo clear from

Digitized by Google

from Scripture, as an Imparity, or of one Order above another of the Clergy. Is there any Thing more clear, than that there were *High Priests*, *Priests* and *Levites* in the Old Testament? And St. *Jerom* tells us, that *Bishops*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons* answered to these Orders in the New Testament.

Is there any Thing more clear, than that the Prophet *Isaiah* foretold, that there should be such an Order in the New Testament, *Isa.* 66. 21. *And I will take of them for* Priests, *and for* Levites? That *Priests* were above the *Levites*, is not debated; now that there were *Chief Priests* in the Old Testament, is as clear, 1 *Chron.* 24. 6. 31. *Ezra* 8. 29. *Numb.* 3. 24. and 30. 35. So *Nehem.* 11. 14, 15, 16. there are two named *Overseers*, which is the same with *Bishops*, the one of the *Priests*, the other of the *Levites*.

And now in the New Testament, did we not see our Saviour institute Twelve, and Seventy; if they were all one Order, why ought they not to be called the Eighty?

Did not our Saviour consecrate the Twelve to preach the Gospel, administer Sacraments, with a Power of binding and loosing, thrusting out the Disobedient, receiving Penitents, and to make their own Successors, with that Power that God gave the Son to send his Apostles, 20 St. *Joh.* 21.

Did not those Apostles ordain their Fellow Labourers and Helpers, and founded Churches, and kept Jurisdiction over Colonies of their own Plantations, as is evident in the Writings of St. *John* and St. *Paul*, who wrote with an Air of Authority; which their Humility and Holiness would not allow them to do over their Equals? That St. *Paul* governed his own Plantations, is plain, when he says, *The Care of all the Churches came upon me*, 2 *Cor.* 11. 28. He governed in his own Absence, 1 *Cor.* 5. 3. and *Col.* 2. 5. He tells, 1 *Cor.* 4. 18, 19. that he should come and visit them, as you may read. And so 2 *Cor.* 13. 2. If he had not Authority, would he threaten them after such a Manner?

The first three Chapters of the *Revelation* shew us, how St. *John* governed the Seven Churches of *Asia* in the Time of his Banishment; and the Dioceses, he had under him, were greater than some Metropolitans now adays.

The *High Priest* of the *Jews* was the Metropolitan of all the *Jewish* Church; and I told before, in my Vindication of St. *Ignatius*'s Epistles, pag. 47, that three Millions of *Jews* legally clean, communicated with the *High Priest*, and partaked with the Altar in the Temple of *Jerusalem*, though they approached it not in their own Persons, and that in the Space of two Hours in the same Afternoon. And may not a Christian Diocess, though never so large, communicate at the same Rate.

So that the *Presbyterian* Objection against Diocesan *Bishops* proceeds from gross Ignorance or Antichristian Design, to keep up a Schism against the Apostolick Order. For it is not a Diocess that makes a *Bishop*; more than a Paroch, Manse and Glebe makes a *Minister*. The Apostles were consecrated *Bishops*, before ever they founded Churches.

That *Bishops* had Dioceses, is clear in the Apostolick Days from S. *James*, when as *Hegesippus* says, the Apostles constituted *Bishops* of *Jerusalem*, *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, *Titus* in *Crete*; and there might be titular *Bishops*, or a College of them in one Place or City waiting to be called to a fixed Place by the moving *Bishops*, I mean the Apostles that planted the Gospel in all Nations, is, according to the Opinion of learned Men, neither unprobable nor unreasonable. And that S. *Peter* and S. *Paul* might be *Bishops* at *Rome*, the one for the *Jews* and the other for the *Gentiles*, because these different Proselytes to Christianity, had their different Rituals, and Ceremonies, is very reasonable.

However, that there was one Otder above another, the first 3 Centuries, is clear from many Books written on the Controverty; and if it be true what is said in this short Sheet, it is impossible for a Thousand Sheets to confute it. And I wish, that the Peers and Gentry, or the learned Laity could satisfy themselves in a Meeting allowed by Authority, in great Libraries where the Ancients are to be had, and if they came with Design to hold fast what is Good; they should find in a short Time, by their very Eyes and Ears the Truth of what is said.

The best of the Presbyterians allow, that there was a fix'd *Moderator* or *Preses* in the great Churches, but not a *Bishop* over *Presbyters*, for both were called *Bishops* or *Presbyters*, say they.

To which I answer, that suppose the Community of Names (which needs not be granted) yet it is proven, that there was one Order above another, as *Priests* had their *Chief Priests* or *Presbyters* their *Chief Presbyter*, who was a fix'd and unchangeable Moderator: Now if this Moderator had all the Right or chief distinguishing Power, which we grant to a *Bishop*, and all that he claims, then why may he not be called the *Bishop* as well as the *Moderator*? For Example, when *Tertullian*, in his Book of Baptism, says; *The* High-priest, *who is the* Bishop, *has the Right of giving Baptism*, after him the Presbyters and Deacons, *but not without the* Bishop's *Authority, and that for the Honour of the Church, which being safe, the Peace is secured.* Now call him, if you will, the *fix'd Moderator*, yet you see, what Authority he had over the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. St. *Ignatius* allows nothing to be done without the *Bishop*. Call him *Moderator*, if you will, yet he was above the *Presbyters* and *Deacons*.

As they were fixed Rulers, or *Bishops*, so the Apostolick Succession was continued by them, and not by the inferior Clergy, as may be seen in the Catalogue of the four Patriarchal Churches, in the History of *Eusebius* to his own Time, and from Historians of other Churches, since the Plantation of Religion.

I add, That these *Bishops* were called by their own Names, as the Twelve Apostles were named, but not the Seventy *Disciples*, which was a Title of Eminency, as *James* of *Jerusalem*; for

Digitized by Google

for it was a Rabbinical Rule, *Rabbi is greater than Rab, and Rabban is greater than Rabbi; but he that is called by his bare Name, without any Title, is greater than Rabban.*

These, who were simply called by their own Names, were greater than the Doctors and Rabbies of the *Jews*.

And now let me argue a little with those, who tell us, that there was nothing but *Presbytery* in the first Three Hundred Years; others will plead as well, and to better Purpose for *Independency*; others will debate against *Infant Baptism*; but seeing at this Time I have to do with the *Presbyterians*, because they plead their Parity from the first Three Ages: Which, if true, will it not follow, *First*, That in the 4th Century, these great Lights, holy Writers, *Fathers* and *Councils* were *Apostates* in turning *Episcopal*: Yea, that *S. Augustine*, *Athanasius*, St. *Basil*, *Eusebius*, *&c.* were all *Antichristian*; and that either they were Block-heads, who did not understand the Practice of the first Three Centuries as well as *Scotish Presbyterians* do now a-days? 2. Will it not follow, that *Aerius*, who was condemned as an Heretick by the Church, was the only Orthodox Person that was in his own Time? 3. Will it not follow, that the venerable and great Council of *Nice* was guilty of horrid Usurpation, that was made up of 318 *Bishops*; and that the *Presbyters* were very silly and mean-spirited Bodies, that protested not their own Right against *Prelatical* Encroachments? 4. Will it not follow, that the Promise of *being with the Apostles to the End of the World*, did fail? And that he was with them, but for Three Hundred Years; since the Church has continued *Episcopal* through the World from the End of the third Century? 5. Will it not follow, that Prophecies have fail'd, which foretold, that *Kings should become nursing Fathers, and Queens nursing Mothers*; and that the Christians were in a better Condition under the bloody Persecutors, than they were under *Constantine* the Great, the first Christian Emperor; and that Magistrates became a Curse instead of a Blessing? 6. Will it not follow, that if the Church-men of the first three Centuries were *Presbyterian*, and had not, yea rather refused *Bishopricks* in the Time of Persecution; yet that they accepted of these *Antichristian* Posts in the Time of Prosperity, especially such as were alive in the End of the third Century, and in the Beginning of the fourth? 7. Will it not follow, that Mr. *Calvin* is extreamly mistaken, who affirms, That *Episcopacy* was in the first three Centuries, and that he knows not what Curse is great enough for those that refuse the *Cyprianic Episcopacy*, which he acknowledges to be the same with all our modern high flown *Cyprianists*.

And now let any Person of a quiet and calm Spirit, a sincere Lover of the Truth, consider, Whether or not it be a Spirit of Contradiction, Interest, Ignorance or Malice, to argue against the Substance for a Ceremony, and against a Principal for an Accessory, from an Infant State against that of Manhood? How many Things would the first Christians be at, and wish they had, that was not in their Power? Would they not be content with a Tabernacle or Temple, when they were hiding themselves in Grotts and Caves, in Holes and Bores? If an *Enthusiast* should argue against a *Presbyterian* thus; the first Christians had not Steeple Houses, nor Stipends, nor Glebes, nor Manses, would not this Question be waved by *Presbyterians* with Contempt? Or else would they not be forced to give the Answer which we give to them in this Point?

If a brain-sick Fellow should have commenced a Schism, and raised a Sect in the Land of *Canaan*, and endeavoured to overturn their rational and solemn Constitutions, and bring them to the State their Forefathers were in when in the Wilderness: And cry out, That there was no Circumcision in the Wilderness, there were no stately Temples nor Synagogues there; nor sitting or leaning at taking the Paschal Lamb there, for they took it standing, in Haste, and their Staves in their Hands; there was no Feast of Tabernacles there: Yea more, *Moses* and *Aaron* were protested against, by the Saints of the Lord, *Core*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, who suffered Martyrdom for the Congregational Way, and for the Rights of the People; did not they boldly tell them, *Ye take too much upon you*, for *all the Congregation is holy* as well as you? Yea did not the Survivers of the Congregation for all they saw, rise against *Moses* boldly to his Face, and tell him, *You have sinned in killing the People of the Lord*? If, I say, such a troublesome schismatical Pack should have risen in the Land of *Canaan*, with such an Harangue and tell them, nay let us be in the State of our honest Forefathers in the Wilderness: I think the best Thing that the Government of Church and State could have done with them, had been to have sent them to the Wilderness; and not let a peaceable Land be disturb'd with such crack-brain'd Incendiaries. But I suppose, they would have reply'd, They could give Scripture for all they said, and tell us, *Numb.* 16. 3, 4. and prove the rest by Scriptures. What would follow upon their Dispute, but the Children of *Israel* should live, as their Fathers did in the Wilderness, and not as they did in *Canaan*?

The *Presbyterians* argue as wildly with us in several Cases, when it is told them, That the first Christians did not rise in Arms against their Persecutors, they tell us, It is, because they were not in Condition to take Arms, being few in Number: Which is very false, for we understand the contrary by the Christian Apologists. But the *Presbyterians* look upon it as a better Condition, when they were able to make Solemn Leagues and Covenants, and to fight against their Kings, and bring them to the Scaffold: Which the poor primitive Christians would not do, tho' they were harass'd with Persecution. This much then for *Episcopacy* in the first three Centuries.

Digitized by Google

Read 22 July 1708

ANIMADVERSIONS upon Mr. William Jameſon's *Writings in general, and upon* The Sum of the Epiſcopal Controverſy *in particular.*

IF Mr. *Jameſon*, handling Cloaths of different Colours, ſhould call Black, White; or White, Black, he ſhould be excuſed, becauſe blind Men are not to judge of Colours: But for a Man to call Good, Evil; and Evil, Good; Truth, Falſhood; and Falſhood, Truth, ſhews a judicial Blindneſs. A Man to advance monſtrous Opinions, and Chymerical Singularities, and that with a petulant Confidence, and ſupercilious Diſdain of the moſt Learned Men of the Church, as if they were not worthy to looſe his Shoes, and to proclaim his own imaginary Victory, with ſlandering and uncivil Language, both maliciouſly and ignorantly, ſhews, that the *God of this World has blinded his Underſtanding*. To make good my Indictment againſt him, I refer to the indifferent World, or to the judicious Part of Mankind, if this Man, who writes 20 or 30 Sheets of Paper in pedantick *Latin*, to prove that the *Papiſts* are *Socinians*, and the *Socinians*, *Papiſts*, does not diſcover a Lunatick Fancy, and Brain-ſick Imagination, rather than ſolid or common Senſe: For Black and White cannot be more different than *Papiſts* and *Socinians* are. The *Papiſts* will have Controverſies decided by the Authority of the Church or a publick Judgment: The *Socinians* Rule is Reaſon or a diſcretive Judgment. The *Papiſts* own the Divinity of Chriſt and the Three Perſons in the Trinity, which *Socinians* deny: And can there be any thing more abſurd than to ſay, that theſe are both one and the ſame thing?

Mr. *Jameſon*'s Ambition and Pride of being called a Learn'd Man, would not allow him to write his *Roma Raccoviana* in his Mother Tongue, but in *Latin*, that he might be admir'd Abroad, as he is among the ignorant *Phanaticks* at Home. But behold the juſt Character that is given of this worthy Piece of his by Learned Foreigners, *That his Book is Sport for Papiſts, and that all Proteſtants ſhould be aſhamed of it, and abhor it with Indignation*, is very well refuted in fewer Lines than there are Leaves in his Book. See *Memoirs de* Trevoux, *Tom.* 7. *P.* 401.

Alas! but Mr. *Jameſon* wants his Trumpeter to counter theſe Foreigners; I mean the learned Mr. *David Williamſon*, who in Pulpit at a General Aſſembly, if I be not miſtaken, told, *We have confounded the Prelatick Clergy upon the Point of Controverſy*; *ay, our blind* Jameſon *has defeat their great Gun, Dr.* Monro. And what was he this Mr. *David*? One that preached and printed, That *Chriſt died a Martyr for Presbyterian Government*, and gave Scripture for it, *John* 19. 19. *Jeſus of Nazareth King of the Jews.* Was not this a very learned Judge to give a Character of a Presbyterian Champion? But it is very like their Cauſe, it will not do otherwiſe for them.

It does not ſerve Mr. *Jameſon* to fall upon particular Perſons of the Church of *England*, ſuch as calling Mr. *Dodwel* a *Brute*, tho' the learned World admires him; yet this he does in his Preface to the Re-printing of Mr. *Davidſon*'s Catechiſm, But he muſt caſt a general Reflection upon the whole Church of *England*, telling, that *That Kingdom where Prelacy is of moſt Account, is fill'd with the moſt idle, naughty, and prophane Clergy-men that are to be found, at leaſt, in the Proteſtant World.* See his *Nazianzeni Querela*, Page 107, 108.

Are the ancient Fathers better treated by Mr. J.? Not they, for of St. *Ignatius* that holy Martyr, his pathetick Stile of Writing, he declares, Page 117. *is altogether inſulſe, putide, and more taſteleſs than the White of an Egg*: Again, in his *Sum of the Epiſcopal Controverſy*, he treats *Epiphanius* in theſe Words; *an ancient Writer indeed, but one of the moſt prejudic'd, paſſionate, and ſuperſtitious, that the Sun had readily ſeen.* *Scultetus* is of another Mind, and endeavours to defend the Antiquity of the Proteſtant Tenets againſt Papiſts by *Epiphanius*'s Authority; but Mr. *Jameſon*'s Character of him (which he never offers to prove) muſt paſs for Demonſtration.

Shall

Digitized by Google

Shall I enlarge this Indictment any farther? Yes, I shall from his Preface to his *Sum of the Episcopal Controversy*, Page 3. and 4. he boldly and blasphemously asserts, that *the Spirit of God had a peculiar View of* Scotland; He adds, (to make his Words more emphatick) *Reforming* Scotland, when he says, by *Isaiah* 55. 3. *I will make an everlasting Covenant with you, even the sure Mercies of David*; and Page 4. when he saith by *Jeremiah* 50. 5. *Come and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual Covenant that shall not be forgotten.*

We are not only, (says Mr. *Jameson*) *to be numbred among these Islanders, of whom the Holy Ghost said, that they should wait for Christ's Law, living in those uttermost Parts of the Earth that were promised to Christ for his Possession. For till of late,* Scotland *was reckon'd one of the utmost Parts of the Earth or known World.* Who may not believe the blasphemous Expressions in the Presbyterian Eloquence, whereby they extol the Covenant, when this rare Champion publishes such Stuff to the World? And not only so, but gives his Advice to all Presbyterian Teachers in the Kingdom to preach upon it, which is accordingly done in *East-Lothian*, and King *Charles* II. call'd a Covenant-Breaker, and the Royal Family is still malign'd in their Pulpits.

Now what Christian in the World, that understands any thing of the Spirit of Christianity, can say, that this Covenant was propheſied for *Scotland*, as a Gospel Blessing? A Covenant! which was an Engine to bring in the worst of Men, into a rebellious Confederacy. High-way Men, Bankrupts, Rogues, Rebels, Atheists were all canonized for Saints, if they were zealous Covenanters, to pull down the Apostolick Government and the Royal Family.

Who but a misled ignorant or a brazen-brow'd Reprobate can deny, that this Covent brought the *Royal Martyr* to the Scaffold? Did not he, who understood the Covenant Principles, Mr. *Shields*, the Author of the *Hind let loose*, avow that it was an Act of great Justice? And does he not vindicate the Murder of the *Arch-Bishop* of St. *Andrew*'s for his Breach of Covenant? And was he not preferr'd to St. *Andrews*, where he had Occasion to preach up the Covenant and Presbyterian bloody Principles? Behold Mr. *Jameson*'s profound Discovery of the Words of the Prophets *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*, *That the Holy Ghost had a View of* Scotland, *reforming* Scotland, *Christ's Possession*, when the Prophets uttered such Expressions.

Now, judicious Reader, after such wild, frantick Speculations of Mr. *Jameson* of which I have not touch'd the tenth Part, tell and judge, if there be any Credit in answering such a wild pitiful Scribbler, who is so full of himself, that he values his blasphemies and Dreams for most wonderful Discoveries, to wit, the *Solemn League and Covenant*, was propheſied of by *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*.

I admire, that such a wonderful Discoverer as Mr. J. does not tell us, That the *Book of the Covenant* spoken of, *Exod.* 24. 6, 7. and the *Book of the Wars of Battles of the Lord*, spoken of; *Numb.* 21. 14. which Books are said to be lost in the *Old Testament*, are now found in the *New Testament*, to be the *Solemn League and Covenant*, which occasioned the valiant Battles of the Lord, to wit the Rebellions against King *Charles* I. and II. Mr. *Jameson* can work Wonders, who finds out Books that were lost in the *Old Testament*.

Yet I shall touch one Point by which Mr. J. thinks, he has ruin'd and overturn'd the Episcopal Cause for ever, and if this be found lighter than Vanity when put in the Balance, and both absurd and false, then all he says falls to the Ground, and that is, *That neither the Ancient nor Modern Advocates for Episcopacy agree among themselves; therefore there can be no Truth in their Pretences, and they contend for meer nothing, and there is no real Foundation for Episcopacy: And that because the Defenders of it differ in their Opinions about it.*

If this be Truth, that there is no such thing in the World, because Men have various Opinions about it, then there is nothing in the World certain. Put his Argument in the Mouths of *Jews* and Heathens against Christians, then the Christian Religion is nothing, because the Professors divide among themselves, some asserting the Divinity of its Founder, others denying it. Put it in the Mouths of Deists, who deny reveal'd Religion, then off goes the Certainty of the Scriptures, because Men debate upon the Canonicalness of some Books therein. Put Mr. J's Principle in the Mouths of those who assert, that there is such a thing as *Antichrist*, it will presently by his Position be concluded that there is no such a thing as *Antichrist*, because of the different Opinions about it. Put this Position in the Mouths of *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*, who agreed among

Digitized by Google

among themſelves, they had this to ſay againſt *Paul* and *Barnabas*, then there is no ſuch a thing as a Goſpel of *Loving one another*, becauſe theſe Preachers of it caſt out among themſelves. Yea put this Argument in the Devil's Mouth, may not he argue againſt Chriſt's Kingdom on Earth, after this Manner; *The Subjects of Chriſt's Kingdom are divided among themſelves: But Chriſt declares that there is no Diviſion in His Kingdom; therefore Sathan's Kingdom is right, and Chriſt's Kingdom wrong.* Mr. *Jameſon*'s whole Book falls to the Ground by this falſe Reaſoning.

I ſhall here inſert the Three Opinions among the Ancients concerning the Import of the Word, *Biſhop*, which all Three confute the Presbyterian Hypotheſis, and that out of the Learn'd Dr. *Whitby*, on the 3d Chapter of the Firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* 1. V.

The *Firſt* is, that of *Theodoret*, *That the Apoſtle here calls the Presbyter, Biſhop, becauſe after the Rules preſcrib'd concerning Biſhops, he deſcends to thoſe concerning Deacons, omitting Presbyters, becauſe,* ſaith he, *anciently the ſame Perſons were ſtil'd Presbyters and Biſhops; the Name Apoſtles being then given to them who are now called Biſhops; but in Proceſs of time, they left the Name of Apoſtles to them who were Apoſtles indeed, and gave this Name of Biſhop peculiarly to them who anciently were ſtiled Apoſtles.* This Opinion aſſerts the Three Orders.

The *Second* Opinion, is that of *Epiphanius*, *That the Apoſtles could not order all things at one time, there being then a Neceſſity of* Presbyters *and* Deacons, *by both which Eccleſiaſtical Matters were to be adminiſtred, they placed no Biſhops there where they found no Perſon worthy of that Office, in other Places where they found Perſons worthy of it, but by Reaſon of the Paucity of Converts found any ſcarce fit to be* Presbyters, *they conſtituted only* Biſhops *and* Deacons; *and this Account, ſaith* Epiphanius, *is taken from the moſt ancient Hiſtories of the Church.*

" I ſuppoſe, *ſays Dr.* Whitby *upon the Words of* Epiphanius, that it was taken from " the Paſſage of *Clemens Romanus.*" This ſhews it was the Deſign of the Apoſtles to inſtitute Three ſeveral Orders in the Church, and where this was not done, it was only for want of fit Perſons to compleat theſe Orders, and only during that Defect, and this being writ only in Anſwer to *Aerius*'s Hereſy, that a Biſhop differ'd not from a Presbyter, they being both of one Order, Dignity and Honour, ſhews that Opinion was not only counted falſe, and novel, but Heretical.

The *Third* Opinion, is that of *Chryſoſtom*, *Oecumenius* and *Hilary* the Deacon on the Place, *That the Apoſtle includes* Presbyer *under the Name of* Biſhops, *becauſe there is no great Difference between them, they being appointed as well as* Biſhops *to teach, and to preſide over the Church, and being only inferior to the* Biſhops *as to the Point of Ordination, which belongs alone to* Biſhops, *and not to* Presbyters. Now even according to this Opinion the *Biſhop* is above the *Presbyter*, and all Ordinations which are not perform'd by the *Biſhop* is irregular, and performed by them who have no Power to ordain.

Now tho' theſe Three Opinions be different, yet they are not contradictory, but agree in this, That the *Biſhop* is above the *Presbyter*, that there was no Presbyterian Parity ever in the Church, and that meer *Presbyters* had never the Power of Ordination in their Hands, and that ſtill there were Three diſtinct Orders. But let us ſee how learnedly Mr. *Jameſon* confutes theſe Fathers.

Firſt, as for *Theodoret*, Page 15. He tells us, That he has ſet down theſe Words at length, that *Men may ſee what Kind of Conſcience they have, who would have People to reſt in it.* And deſires the Reader, *if any Prelatiſt bring up this ſenſeleſs Parcel of Words, to tell them, that they lean upon a falſe Interpolation of the* Greek *Word*, Απόστολος, Phil. 2 25. *If he go on to quibble, let him tell him, That the* Engliſh *Tranſlators, moſt of whom were Prelatiſts, render it not Apoſtle, but Meſſenger, and challenge him to refute theſe Tranſlators if he can. Let him tell him moreover, that* Theodoret *an ancient Interpreter, who firſt invented this falſe Meaning of the Word, believed not himſelf, if we may believe* Medina *the Jeſuit, and other Learned and reſolute Prelatiſts,* &c. And now I have ſet down Mr. J's Anſwer, that the Reader may paſs his Judgment upon it, and ſee what a bold proofleſs Aſſertion he makes, and nothing at all to *Theodoret*'s Opinion; which ſhews that the Apoſtles kept Juriſdiction over *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, who were above the *Deacons*, and conſequently aſſerts the Three Orders, and is good Senſe in ſpite of Mr. J's Confutation.

As to *Epiphanius* his Opinion, which he tells he took from the moſt ancient Hiſtories of the Church, Mr. J. calls it falſe, abſurd and impertinent, becauſe it ſuppoſes that ſome were fit to be *Biſhops*, and not to be *Presbyters*; And might not this be at ſome time, and not ſo at another, and the Miniſterial Acts perform'd by *Biſhops* and

Deacons

Digitized by Google

Deacons till the *Deacons* had fulfill'd their *Deaconship* and be made *Presbyters.* But, says Mr. *J. Nothing more nonsensical than this Fiction of* Epiphanius, *an old Writer indeed, but one of the most prejudic'd passionate and superstitious that the Sun had readily seen.* Pray Mr. *Jameson* wherefore was he passionate, because he called *Aerius* a silly Fellow of Yesterday, who went cross to the Practice of the universal Church, by denying the Distinction between *Bishop* and *Presbyters*, and that because he miss'd a Bishoprick himself?

Again, says Mr. *J. Epiphanius* says, *He had this from ancient Historians, and what Temptation had the learned Father to lie? Episcopacy being the universal Government of the Church, and what co-tempotary did ever confute that Father?* Again, says Mr. *J.* The present *Prelatists* say, he had it from *Clement*, whom the Apostle to the *Philippians* commends, tho' it is certain that *Clement* is altogether *Presbyterian*, maintaining only two Orders of Kirk-men.

Now, were there no more to disgrace the whole Book, and to discredite the Author as unworthy to be believed, this is enough; for it could not escape Mr. *J*'s Knowledge, that *Clement* makes three Orders of Church-men above *Lay-men*, in the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, 40 Sect. in these Words, *For the* Chief-Priest *has his proper Service, and to their* Priests *their proper Place is appointed: and to the* Levites *appertain their proper Ministeries, and the Layman is confin'd within the Bounds of what is commanded to a* Layman. And yet he tells, that St. *Clement* makes only two Orders of Kirk-men, as he phrases it in his phanatical Stile throughout his Book. He could not but know this but the mercenary Conscience of him will serve the Idol of *Presbytery* at any Rate. And tho' in the 42 Sect. he mentions *Bishops* and *Deacons*, or Ministers as the Word should be translated, yet this was in the Days of the Apostles who were above these two Orders.

As to the *Third* Opinion by St. *Chrysost.* Mr. *J.* tells us, That *the Words of the Father rendred thus*, which belong alone to Bishops and not to Presbyters, *can bear another Sense, thus*, which the Bishops have fraudulently taken from the Presbyters. *And thus the Writer ought to be understood. Wherefore some of the Prelatists as the Jesuit* Bellarmine *endeavour to deprave his Words; others of them condemn him as an* Aerian *Presbyterian Heretick.* Mr. *J.* never tells us where *Bellarmine* depraves his Words, nor who these are that ever look'd upon *Chrysostom* as a *Presbyterian*: But this deserves as little Credit as any thing else that ever he said; he's resolved to stake his Soul for Presbytery. Now, to say, that St. *Chrysostom* did mean, which *the Bishops fraudulently took from the Presbyters*, is against Sense and Reason; for it is a Thing that never was done by the *Bishops*, nor ever meant by St. *Chrysostom.* For this were to cast a black Stain on his own Order, being Bishop of *Constantinople.* And it were also to contradict himself in other Places, particularly on these Words *Acts* 15. 19. *My Sentence is*, &c. He says, Ἐγὼ κείνω, *I judge*, that is, saith St. *Chrysostom, I with Authority say this*, and tells, that this Determination of the Question was made by *James*, because he had the Government committed to him, and then, St. *Chrysostom*'s Notion of the Word *Presbytery*, in 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. Is not a Senate of ordinary *Presbyters*, and the Reason because *Timothy* was a *Bishop*, and it was never heard nor read, that *Presbyters* could ordain a *Bishop.*

Now, who but a bigotted Bedlamite, would say, that St. *Chrysostom* meant, that *the Bishops had fraudulently taken this from the Presbyters.*

This is sufficient to expose Mr. *J.* and all that ever he wrote on his Cause, to be disingenuous, malicious and nonsensick. As for what he has said of Mr. *Calder*, of being a Man of no Conscience. Mr. *Calder* replies, That for the World he would not have Mr. *Jameson*'s Conscience; and he would think it as great a Reproach as could be cast upon him, to be commended by Mr. *J.* and refers to any if he has answered Mr. *Calder*'s Book, the strongest or the tenth Part of his Arguments. It is but short and soon read, and let any who has Leisure, compare them together and give their Judgments if they will. In the End M. *J.* accuses the *Episcopal* Clergy with the Want of a *Gospel-Spirit.* To which I answer no more, but that Fire and Water are as reconcileable and consistent together as the Spirit of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, is with Christ's Sermon on the Mount. And if *Presbyterians* hated *bloody Principles, Rebellion, Schism, Lying, Slandering, accusing of the Brethren, Uncleanness, intemperance*, in a Word, all Deviliſh and beastly Sins as much as they do *Episcopacy* and the Book of *Common Prayer*, they had been Men of the best Morals in the World; and yet tho' they were as good and godly as they call themselves, they could not be called a true Church, nor be under a lawful Ministry so long as they continue *Presbyterian.*

A

Digitized by Google

A REPLY to Mr. William Jameſon's *Preface to Mr.* John Davidſon's *Catechiſm, in ſo far as concerns Mr.* Robert Calder's *Citation of a Paſſage out of Mr.* Davidſon's Burthen of a loaded Conſcience.

MR. *William Jameſon*, that indefatigable Zealot for Covenanted Presbytery, has given ſuch Proofs in his Writings of an ill Conſcience and a perverted Judgment (as I've made out already in my former Number) as has expoſed him at Home and Abroad to the juſt Cenſure of all knowing and ingenuous Perſons, as might make his Party bluſh; but they are aſhamed of nothing. For, he that will ſay, That the Prophets, *Iſaiah* and *Jeremiah*, had a View to *Scotland*, and meant the *Solemn League and Covenant*, and that *Scotland* was the utmoſt Part of the Earth, promiſed to *Chriſt* for his Poſſeſſion; and earneſtly requeſts the Kirkmen to preach up and catechiſe upon that Covenant, and upon Presbyterian Principles; and that the *Papiſts* are *Socinians*; and the *Socinians*, *Papiſts*; and that S. *Ignatius* and S. *Cyprian* were Presbyterian in their Principles, may ſay any thing he pleaſes: Yea, he may write a Book to prove, that a Sow is an Eagle; and a Horſe, a Swan; and what may not ſuch a Perſon undertake? A worthy Champion for ſuch a worthy Cauſe! He advances ſuch monſtrous Opinions, that it is no wonder his Name, *viz.* MASTER WILLIAM JAMESON, ſhould, by holding out one M, produce this Anagram, I AM A VILE MONSTER AS LIVES: And truly his Writings prove no leſs. Which Anagram I never deſigned to publiſh (altho' it be very agreeable to his Way of writing) if he had not reſented ſo maliciouſly what was made upon his Scoundrel, DUMBARTON JOHN ANDERSON Yoke-Fellow's Name, which is, OUR DAMN'D JOHN BANTERS ON.

Sometimes, yea very frequently, he falls into Fits of Madneſs, and looks liker a Demoniack than one in his ſober Wits; for ſo full is he of himſelf, ſuch Conceit he has of his own Abilities, that he thinks all Learned Antagoniſts compared with himſelf, but as Dwarfs to a Giant. But beſides the monſtrouſneſs of the Opinions he advances, his ſlandering and lying Genius is palpable and notorius in his Writings: This indeed is a Qualification, which the Cauſe requires; for it will not do otherwiſe for the Party.

I come then to examine his baſe, unchriſtian, malicious and diſingenuous Dealing with my Perſon, particularly in the Caſe of Mr. *John Davidſon*'s Book, called the *Burthen of a loaded Conſcience*, which I cited in a Vindication of my Sermon, preached on 30th of *January*. 1703. The Words are, *Be obedient to Arch-biſhops and Biſhops, and ſtand not out againſt them, as I have wickedlie done.*

Mr. *Jameſon*, in his firſt Acquaintance with me at *Edinburgh*, where I was at the Time, but had my Reſidence in the *North*, told me, He would gladly know of that Catechiſm, which Mr. *Davidſon* wrote, for he never heard of it. I told him, it was a Book, which Mr. *Robert Ramſay*, Miniſter of the *Panns*, had; but that now he being dead, I knew not how to come at it, if his Relict had it not. After this, I went to her, and told my Deſire. She ſaid, ſhe could not meddle with any Book that belonged to her Husband, for all were ſeal'd up in order to an Auction. I could not urge her any further, and ſo went *North* afterwards. And ſometime after, I was charged from the *North* to *Edinburgh*, as I was ſeveral Times, for uſing the Book of *Common Prayer*, I met Mr. *Jameſon*, and he was very preſſing and earneſt with me to get a Sight of that Book, and he asked me what Way might I take to get it. I told, that I ſhould ſpeak to Mr. *Miller* who was Miniſter at *Inverask*, near to the *Panns*, and he would make Search in the *Panns* or the contiguous Paroches thereto. This was all I ſaid of Mr. *Miller*. Yet Mr. *Jameſon* tels us, Page 3. That I ſhould have ſaid, That Mr. *Miller* had the Book, than which there can be nothing more falſe; and I appeal to Mr. *Jameſon*, if

Digitized by Google

if he did not afterwards (before Company) declare as much. However, to make Things more clear, I shall give the whole Story from the Beginning.

In the Year 1684, when I was a Probationer, I used sometimes to go to the Country, and to preach for Ministers of my Acquaintance, and several times for Mr. *Ramsay* at the *Panns*. One Day, I began to talk of Mr. *Davidson*, who was so wonderfully magnified in a Book, called *The Fulfilling of the Scriptures*, (a very legendary Book, and will speak as much for the new Prophets and their Agitations as any Book was ever published by themselves.) Mr. *Ramsay* fell very much in his Predecessor's Commendations. I ask'd him, if ever he wrote any? He told me, that he had a Catechism of his dedicated to his Parochiners, with a small Treatise at the End of it, called *The Burthen of a loaded Conscience*. I desired a Sight of it for sometime, and first of all read that Tract in the End, which was printed 3 Years after the Catechism, and, according to my Custom in reading, excerpt what pleased me, and especially out of the old Presbyterians, to shew, how far the present Set of them degenerates in many good things from their Ancestors. By this way of reading I made a good Store of Collections in a large Manuscript, that was taken from me & kept, with many other Papers, by Sir *James Stewart* Advocate, when I was made Prisoner by him for Six Months, and other Five Months after I was assoilzied; but never yet got I my Papers returned, where my Citations out of Mr. *Davidson*'s Book were amongst the rest. However, Mr. *Ramsay* being alive at that time in the Year 1693, and having the Book, I pressed him several times to cause re-print it, but how he neglected it, I know not. For a little after I came out of Prison I went North and lived, and the said Mr. *Ramsay* died long before I returned South, which was occasioned by two Summons from *Aberdeen*, and three from *Elgin*, whether I went to live when banished from *Aberdeen*. At last being restrained to exercise at *Elgine*, I was obliged to come South and live, because of the tedious and expensive Journies my Persecutions made me to undergo.

But as to the Business of Mr. *Davidson*, I made all the Search imaginable to satisfy Mr. *Jameson*, and I bespoke Sir *Robert Sibbald*, who told, me he had Mr. *Davidson*'s Catechism, but not that Tract of *The Burthen of a loaded Conscience*. It was no wonder for the Catechism was printed in 1602, and the other Tract in 1608.

The Approbation was given to the Catechism by the Provincial Assembly of *Lothian* and *Tweeddale* in *November* 1599.

From this I argue, when Mr. *Jameson* never knew, that Mr. *Davidson* had written a Catechism, till I made mention of it in one of my Pamphlets, and when such a Book was so scarce and so ill to be had, notwithstanding that it was published by the Authority of the Provincial Assembly: Is it a wonder that the Treatise, that was printed thereafter, should be lost, especially since it was a Book that pulled down the Fury of Presbyterians upon it, because it did fly in their Faces?

At last when I despaired of ever seeing it, I only satisfied my self with a good Conscience, that I had seen such a Book, and that I noted down several things which I had in my Memory, tho' my Papers were taken from me by the Advocate. There was also another thing I had to say, That the Learned and worthy Dr. *George Mackenzie*, had the Reverend and pious Mr. *Laurence Charters* his Catalogue of *Scots* Writers, and had that Tract of Mr. *Davidson*'s, called *The Burthen of a loaded Conscience* among the rest; but this was not enough with Mr. *Jameson* who triumph'd and insulted in his imaginary Victory. At length, by good Providence, a good Friend of mine, Mr. *John Gullen*, well known for Learning, Candour and Modesty, going to *London* with his Pupil, told the Reverend and Learned Mr. *James Gray*, who was in the noble Family of *Roxburgh*. He was first, Minister at *Haddington* before 1688; and afterwards at *Kelso*, and formerly a Disciple at Theology, with Mr. *Charters*, with whom he was most intimate. The said Mr. *Gullen* told Mr. *Gray*, That Mr. *Calder* was at a Loss for citing a Passage of a Book of Mr. *Davidson*'s which he could not produce. Mr. *Gray* replied, he had the Book in *Scotland*, and he would depone, these Words of being *obedient to Arch-Bishops and Bishops*, &c. were there; and afterwards when Mr. *Gray* came to *Scotland*, he sent me the Book with a sure Hand, and when I met him at *Edinburgh*, he told me, how, in common Converse, he used to produce that Passage of Mr. *Davidson*'s for the Confutation of *Presbyterians*, which cankered them with Spite and Venom. At last he found the Book stolen from him, and despaired of ever recovering it; but at length the said Mr. *Gray* having lent several Books to a Servant in the Family, he came to his Wife and demanded some

of

Digitized by Google

of the Books he had lent her Husband, for he had present Use for them. The Wife desired him to go into the Closet, and take any Book he pleased whether they were his own or not; which he did, and the first he lighted on, was Mr. *Davidson*'s which he pack'd up. And when he cast up the Passage with which he used to vex the Presbyterians, he found three Lines torn where that Passage was, which gave him a further Discovery of the Spirit of that Party. And sure I am, Mr. *Jameson* would do so to many Passages in the *New Testament*, and the ancient Fathers, if it were in his Power, for he has done the Equivalent by mangling them with his Presbyterian Glosses.

At length Mr. *George Semple*, a learned and modest young Gentleman, and a *Presbyter*, being acquainted with Mr. *Jameson*, wrote to him the Matter of Fact as I have told. Mr. *Jameson* gave a Return in some of his lucid Intervals, and signify'd, *That the Person, who tore a Book, should be lash'd with Thorns*, and that he would believe Mr. *Calder* as to that Passage of the Book which was found; but I hear since, that he is like to bite off his own Fingers for that he was so just in his Letter to Mr. *Semple*. Mr. *Jameson* coming to *Edinburgh*, came to Mr. *Calder*'s House with Witnesses on both Sides; and after the reading of that Treatise, we went out to some House; and at last Mr. *Jameson* rising in a mad Fit of Passion, he said to Mr. *Calder*, *You have been too temerarious, I can prove by intrinsick, intrinsick Arguments*, which he pronounced in an Emphatical Fury, and thereafter he told he had defeat me: And behold this was all the Confutation.

I think, he and his whole Gang will have more than enough to do in that Undertaking: For the Book consists of pious penitential Meditations on the Breach of all the Commandments, and not unworthy of Mr. *Davidson*, who was sometime a factious Man in Church and State, and therefore his Conscience was stung for the Disturbance that he made in both; for, in that same torn Leaf, he gives this Advice,

Meddle not with the State matters above your calling: for it is a spice of a rebellious nature to call the doing of higher powers into Question, and to find fauls with them. If anie thing seeme amisse, praie humblie to God, that he will mercifully cause it to be amended; and do you carefullie endeavour to amend your own self. For it maie be that your sinne is some part of cause why there is any want of grace in your Governours. This is your best waie, and not to, &c. Then follows the next Page where it was torn, but I remember the Words are, *and not to stand out against them as I have wickedly done*, and then the Words followed *Be obedient to Archbishops and Bishops and stand not out against them as I have wickedly done*. And then follows, *Have always a reverent opinion of your Minister otherwise you shall greatlie endanger your souls as I have done.*

That he had the Character of a very factious Man is not deny'd; for Mr. *Jameson*, in the 5th Page, makes his Factiousness to be strong Resolution and Zeal, and therefore this Recantation is not unworthy of Mr. *Davidson*. Hear his own Confession, Page 8. 9.

My heart being not knit unto God, but to the world, I framed my religion to mine affection, and mine affection to imagination; first, I was hote against the Romane *Religion, then being much befreinded by some that favored that Religion, I to gratify them, grewe in good liking of it also, yea so farre forth, that I became a recusant, was received into that Church of* Rome *by a seminary Priest, and did what I could to perswade many others to leare that Way. But when trouble was likely to fall upon me, I went to Church again: and so by little and little fell off: yet so as where I found any of that Religion, I was still suitable unto them.*

After this I beeing kindely used of some, that were commonly called puritans, took liking of their opinions; yea and in some points was ready to runne beyond them; and all this in great shewe of Zeale towards God, so that I made my self believe, that I was in the right way, and did well. I doe often wonder at my selfe, how feruent I was, first a Protestant, than a Romane Catholike, afterward a precisian, so that I took upon me to rebuke many, yea and some of high degree, as though I had been a very man of God, full of the Holy Ghost: whereas indeed the deuel was in my heart, and therefore all my waies were sinneful, and displeasing unto God.

These Words I have set down in the way that they were then spell'd, and to let see that they suit no other Person but Mr. *Davidson*, of whose Confinement the Presbyterians wrote, but not of his Death; and no wonder, because his Penitentials are disagreeable to their Principles. This, with Mr. *Laurence Charters* his inserting that Tract as Mr. *Davidson*'s in the *Scotish* Writers, sufficiently proves what I have said.

I hope now I have vindicated my self from the malicious Aspersion of that firie, proud, passionate and viperous Zealot, who makes it his Business to serve the worst

of

Digitized by Google

of Cauſes, with pitiful Sophiſms, a Multitude of Words, and a Wilderneſs of Impertinencies, he muſt write much to no Purpoſe, becauſe he can ſay but little to the Purpoſe.

Our Cauſe (Thanks to God) needs no ſuch baſe Methods, nor would I take it in Hand, tho' I were ſure never to be diſcovered. I could find no greater Enemies than my own Friends, and thoſe of my own Communion, if they found any ſuch thing as this baſe Calumniator charges me with: For the Truth of the Premiſes I could declare upon my Sacrament, if I were ſtepping preſently into another World, as I know not how ſoon. I wiſh Mr. *Jameſon* and his Fellow Apologiſts a more Goſpel-Spirit, which I am ſure, God will never grant, ſo long as they are Slaves to ſuch a Party, and are violent for ſuch a Cauſe as would crucify Chriſt again, if He proteſted againſt their *Solemn League and Covenant*, which is as contrary to a Goſpel-Spirit as *Turciſm* is to *Chriſtianity*.

I find Mr. *Jameſon*, in his Preface to Mr. *Davidſon*'s Catechiſm, very preſſing to renew their Covenants, but not a Word of bringing in the reading of the Scriptures, or the Uſe of ancient Creeds into the publick Worſhip. Yea the Kirk will overlook the blaſphemous Scribblers againſt the *Lord's Prayer*, calling it *A Lifeleſs, loathſome, ſapleſs Worſhip, and an Engine from Hell to overturn the Goſpel*: As the Author of the *Caſuiſtical Eſſay* does. But that Idol of a bloody Covenant muſt be brought in: What! Muſt we be for War at Home, ſince the Peace is concluded Abroad? And can there be a more effectual Courſe fallen on to breed Wars in *Britain*, than that curſed and bloody Covenant, which, in former Times, overturned the Apoſtolical Succeſſion, and the Royal Family? Ought not ſuch Incendiaries and Fire-Brands be taken notice of? For can any Government be in Peace, when ſuch bloody Projects are ſet on Foot?

I foreſee, that, among many Cenſures I may meet with, this will be one, that I ſhew more Favour for Papiſts than for Proteſtants.

It is indeed the Method of pitiful Scribblers and falſe Teachers, to call every Thing Popery, that is not Presbyterian; tho' indeed they have the worſt Things that ſome Papiſts have, but nothing of their beſt. It is by ſuch Means, they have baniſhed Senſe and Reaſon out of the Church. I wiſh when any writes againſt Papiſts or any other Party, they may do it with Truth and Senſe, by ſtating the Controverſy fairly, and in plain Language, not with bombaſt Vocables, as Mr. *Jameſon* uſes; ſuch as *Syncretizing* and *Papaturients*; or by taking the Opinion of a private Doctor for the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, as Mr. *Jameſon* does, taking *Catharinus* his Notion of Original Sin for the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, for which the learn'd Foreigners have expoſed his *Roma Raccoviana*. Such Methods as theſe are very far from doing Service to the Proteſtant Intereſt.

THE

Edinburgh, December 17. 1712. Num. XXX.

THE

Nail ſtruck to the Head;

OR

An Indictment drawn up againſt Mr. John Anderſon, *the Presbyterian Incumbent at* Dumbarton, *before all the Colleges in* Britain, *and* Ireland, *or any other Inferior Library-Courts, in City, or Country, and that before Perſons of Knowledge, Conſcience, and Candour, of whatſoever Principle or Party they are, by Mr.* Robert Calder *Miniſter of the Goſpel; who is acting and ſuffering for the Book of Common-Prayer in* Scotland.

IF a Man err through Weakneſs or Miſinformation, it is pardonable; but if he err through Wilfulneſs and Deſign, it is a Wickedneſs before God and Man. Men are ordinarly very warrie, that they be not deceived in their Coyns, Corn, or Cattle, in Matters of Traffique. The Deceived is to be pitied, but the wilful Deceiver is puniſhable in the Courts of Heaven and Earth. And this Crime I lay to Mr. *John Anderſon*'s Charge; and if I do not make it good, let the Laws of the Nation, and the Univerſities chaſtiſe me as they think fit. But if I do, I think, beſides leaving off further Scolding and Scribling, his Credit ſhould die in Infamy, for impoſing notorious Untruths upon Men under the broad Eye of the World; as aſſerting, *That the Church of* England *maintains any part of the* Trent-Creed; *That it damns all Children dying without Baptiſm; That it makes Marriage a Sacrament; That the Book of Common Prayer is* Popery.

I paſs over his confident Affirmations, as, *That the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, was more frequently given the Twelve laſt Years bypaſt, in moſt Paroches in the Kingdom, than in all the Twenty eight Years during the time of Epiſcopacy.* I know not what the Weſt may ſay; but I am ſure, moſt Paroches in Eaſt, South, and North, will give him the Lye.

I paſs by the uncivil Reflexions he uſes againſt the *Biſhops*, and *Doctors* of the Church of *England*; as calling Biſhop *Sanderſon*, *Half-mad*; Dr. *Sacheverel*, *Monſtrum nulla virtute redemptum*; Dr. *South*, *A Man more fit for a Bedlam than for a Pulpit.*

I omit the Character he gives the *Scots* Clergy; as, *That they never ſo much as peep'd into the Fathers, nor Councils, nor know the Age wherein they liv'd, nor the Language they wrote in; or that ſecond hand Shreds from the Rag-Market, is all the Furniture we are to expect from* Scots *Liturgick Curates*; and his confident boaſting of Learning, and deſpiſing the Epiſcopal Clergy as if he had the *Vatican* in his Head; or as if he were a living Library himſelf.

I paſs over the general Scandals and Slanders upon our Clergy, and particularly upon my ſelf, as being more proper to come before a Commiſſary or Criminal Court than before an Univerſity.

I paſs over his Libelling the Church of *England* for Omitting the Reading of many Dark and Myſterious Places in Scriptures, ſome Chapters conſiſting of *Hebrew* Names, Genealogies, and Chronologies, not ſo edifying for a vulgar Auditory, as the plain Eccleſiaſtical Books of the Old Teſtament, called the *Apocrypha*. I refer to the Phyſicians of Soul and Body, whether or not the Author of *Eccleſiaſticus* contradicts himſelf Chap. 28 15. when he ſaith, *He that ſinneth againſt his Maker, let him fall into the Hand of the Phyſician.* He extolling the Phyſician in the preceeding 14 *ver.* and in the 5 *ver.* deſcribes him, as M. *A*-- ſaith, *as a plague of God:* And examine whether the *Son of Sirach* means the Patient, whoſe lewd Life brings him into the Hand of the Phyſician, and not the Phyſician himſelf who is an Inſtrument in God's Hand for his Recovery.

I refer to my former Numbers, Whether or not M. *A*-- has vindicated himſelf from the Scandal of Impudence, in objecting the Omiſſions of ſome Chapters in the Bible; whereas they read no Scripture at all, except an immediate Expoſition follow thereupon, which was the Errour that Mr. *Robert Bailie* objected againſt the Independents, in the former Days of Presbytry.

I refer it alſo to the Readers of both our Anſwers, Whether or not thoſe that cry out againſt the *Liturgiſts*, prefer their own Words to the Word of God; as I told in my Anſwer to the Dialogue *Pag.* 17. preferring their own Preachings, to the Reading of the Scriptures; witneſs the Anſwer to that *Queſtion* in both *Catechiſms.*

How is the Word made effectual to Salvation?

The *Anſwer* is, *The Spirit of God maketh the Reading, but eſpecially the Preaching of the Word, an effectual mean of Convincing and Converting Sinners, and building them up in Holineſs and Comfort through Faith unto Salvation.* Obſerve theſe Words, *eſpecially the Preaching.*

I refer it alſo to the Judicatories to which I Appeal, whether or not in Mr. *A*--'s Examination of Mr. *C*--'s *Anſwer to the Dialogue betwixt the Curate & the Country man*, this be a ſound and ſolid Opinion of Mr. *Anderſon*'s, *That* 17 *Chap. of the* 2 Chron. *is alone more edifying than the half of the Apocrypha, but Horace more edifying than the whole.* For ſo the Words will bear when he oppoſes it to the half, ſo that *Horace* muſt be better or twice as good as the 17 Chap. of the 2 *Chronicles.*

I pitch upon, and ſhall prove three wilful notorious Untruths in Mr. *A*--'s Examination of my Anſwer to his Dialogue.

Firſt, p. 23. he ſays, *That I am guilty of a palpable Miſrepreſentation of the Author of* the Caſuiſtical Eſſay on the Lord's Prayer, *but leaves me to be chaſtiſed by the Author.*

Let the Judges determine, whether or not I have miſrepreſented that Author, when I repeated his very Words in my Anſwer p. 11. where I told, That the Author in his *Caſuiſtical Eſſay* ſays, p. 318. *That the frequent ſaying of the Lord's Prayer is a liſeleſs, ſapleſs, and loathſome Worſhip.* And p. 321. *That the concluding with theſe Words, rather than at any other time, is an Engine of Hell, not only for contrary to the Divine Preſcript, but likewiſe ſubverſive of the Goſpel of Chriſt*, Yea he tells, *That he doubts not of the Concurrence of thoſe that are exerciſed in Godlineſs to ſay with him.* Wherein then have I miſrepreſented the Author, when I repeated his very Word?

Again Mr. *A*-- in his Examination of the Anſwer p. 34. ſays, *When he in his Dalogue objected a Contradiction in the Old and New Verſion of the Pſalms; particularly the* 105 Pſal. 28. v. *And they were not Obedient to his Word*; In the Bible

Bible it runs thus, *And they rebelled not againſt his word.* And he tells the Reader, that all the Anſwer I gave was, *That the Old Tranſlation is preferable to the New.* Whereas the Reader of my Anſwer p. 21, 22. may find that I gave Twenty five Lines more for an Anſwer.

I told that by Reading of *Capellus*, or *Pool*'s *Synopſis*, which he has out of Mr. *Fuller*'s Miſcellanies, he ſhould find that that is preferable to the New Tranſlation. *For there the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks of God's wonderful Works, againſt the* Egyptians, *and ſuch (according to the new Verſion) rebelled not againſt his Word, that is,* Moſes, Aaron, *and the* Iſraelites: *Or as* Junius *and* Tremellius *have it, his Signs rebelled not againſt his Word. And that in the Liturgy is agreeable to the greateſt Number of Latin Copies in S.* Auguſtin's *time, and to the* Septuagint, *expreſſing it thus, And they were not obedient to his Word, (meaning the* Egyptians) *continuing rebellious againſt the Miracles, and Signs of God: and that is reconcilable to the* Hebrew *Text, if the Word (N O T) be admitted to include an interrogation, as the ſame word doth.* Exod. 8. 26. *And did they not rebel againſt his Word?* This and Fourteen Lines more I gave in Anſwer to that common Objection; and yet he ſays. *That all I Anſwer, is, That the Old Tranſlation is preferable to the New.*

I ſhall only add another Inſtance, which I have partly done already, when in my Anſwer p. 30. I cite ſo many Authorities from the Ancients, and ingenuouſly cite my ſecond Hand Authors, to wit, Dr. *Resbury* in the Collection of the Caſes, *&c.* and Dr. *Ellis Du' Pin*, What is Mr. *A*--'s reply to this, p. 43? *Why all this waſte of your Learning in Antiquity, eſpecially when like the poor Man's Ax, alace! it was Borrowed*; which Reflection Mr. *A*-- has out of *Thomas Fuller* B. D. in his *Triple Reconciler, Second Reconciler.* p. 94.

Mr. *A*-- adds, *and I can tell you Page and Leaf where.* Here I offer good Security to Mr. *A*-- for Twenty Guineas if he can give any other Author, but what I have cited; and then that Author he produces muſt cite the Authors which I named, or elſe he ſays nothing. He is oblig'd to ſtake other Twenty, as ſurely he may Fourty (if he be ſure that he has Printed nothing but Truth;) which if he refuſe to do, I leave it to all ingenuous Men to Determine what Credit may be given to his Word, or Write in any thing he has hitherto Printed.

Mr. *A*-- in his Dialogue having charged the Church of *England* with Popery; Mr. *Calder* asked what was Popery in it? Did it own the *Pope*'s Supremacy, which is truly and properly Popery? Or had it any Tincture of the *Trent-Creed* in it? Mr. *Anderſon* replied, If it had nothing of the *Trent-Creed* in it, it was a very ill Book, for the *Trent-Creed* begins thus, *I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things Viſible and Inviſible.* Now let the World judge, how this came to be a part of the *Trent-Creed*, which is truly the *Nicen-Creed*, as it was inlarged by the Council of *Conſtantinople*, particularly in that Article of the Holy Ghoſt, whom the Heretick *Macedonius*, aſſerted to be but a meer Creature and Servant of God; as the *Arians* affirm'd of the Second Perſon of the Trinity: And the Book of *Common Prayer* has that Creed as it came from theſe two Councils, but not at all as it came from the Council of *Trent*, which added Twelve Articles of their Unwritten Traditions to it, for which the Papiſts call the Twenty four Articles the *Trent-Creed*. But when the firſt Twelve Articles ſtand by themſelves, they can in no Propriety of Speech be called the *Trent-Creed*; ſince it wants the Twelve Articles, which Pope *Pius* the IV. added to the *Nicen-Creed*. The Church of *England* proteſts againſt that which is called the *Trent-Creed*. And Learned Men think the Twenty four Articles improperly called the *Trent-Creed*, and good Reaſon for it; becauſe they are not both of a piece. For the firſt Twelve Articles are Compoſed from written Traditions; the other *Tridentine* Articles are compoſed of unwritten Traditions. If a Man had a Table, whereof the one half is Gold, and the other half Braſs, it were improper to call that a Golden or a Braſen Table: But ſeparate them and make two Tables of them, then properly the one is called a Golden; and the other, a Brazen-Table.

M. *A*-- adds, That even in thoſe Articles of the *Tridentine Creed, the* 15. *is, I do alſo receive and admit the received and approved Rites of the ſaid Catholick Church in the Solemn Adminiſtration of Sacraments; whereof* he tells, *the Croſs in Baptiſm, Kneeling at the Communion, and the Ring in Marriage, are three.* See here what a Trick is put upon the Credulity of Men, eſpecially ſuch as are not acquainted with the Book of *Common Prayer*, If this be an Article of the Church of *England*'s Faith; or if it be in any of the three Creeds, which ſhe profeſſes; or from the one End of the *Common-prayer* to the other; or in any of the XXXIX Articles of that Church: Mr. *Anderſon*, by a reſponſible Gentleman of my Acquaintance, ſhall be holden for Fifty Guineas, for Ten of his Staking. And if he do not hold, I leave it to the ingenuous World to judge, whether or not Mr. *A*-- be a good Man, who thus wilfully and deſignedly impoſes upon the Readers of his Book. Mr. *A*-- is poſitive, that this is the Third Article of the *Trent-Creed*, properly ſo called, and the Fifteenth, as it is in the Addition to the Twelve *Nicen* Articles; and makes a great Noiſe about it, as if it were worth the while; but ſeeing he contends ſo hotly for it, I ſay it is but the Fourth in the one, and the Sxteenth in the other; and ſhall make it out before the Court I have appealed to.

Mr. *A*-- p. 8. will have the Church of *England* hold Marriage for a Sacrament, whether it will or not, and one reaſon he gives is, *Becauſe the Church of* England *in her Catechiſm defines Marriage to be a viſible Sign of an inviſible Grace*; And that there are only two Sacraments generally neceſſary to Salvation. Now what ſays the Church of *England*, but what all ſound Proteſtants do in the like Caſe? For if men contend for the Word, *Sacrament*, which is not in Scripture ſtile, and take it in a large Senſe, they'll not only acknowledge to the Papiſts ſeven Sacraments, but if they will, Seventy Seven. See Mr. *Menzies's Papiſmus Luciferus*, paſt in Letters betwixt him and Jeſuit *Dempſter*, alias *Rhind* or *Logan*, his Tenth and laſt Letter.

Mr. *A*-- in his Letter p. 6. affirms with a great deal of Confidence, That the *Nicen-Creed* is not in all the Book of *Common Prayer*, from the one end to the other. I do not underſtand his meaning by this: For if he means, that is but the *Conſtantinopolitan-Creed*; then he nor any Man cannot deny, but that it is the *Nicen-Creed*. For wherever the *Conſtantinopolitan-Creed* is, ſurely there is the *Nicen*; but it will not follow, wherever the *Nicen* is, that there is the *Conſtantinopolitan*. The *Creed*, which we call the *Apoſtles*, goes ſtill under that Name, tho' After-Times added theſe Articles, or further Enlargments, *The Deſcent into Hell, the Communion of Saints, and the Life everlaſting.*

If Mr. *A*-- means, (as ſurely he does) That it is not called the *Nicen-Creed*, from the one end of the Book of Common Prayer to the other. I Anſwer, *Firſt*, It is never there called the *Conſtantinopolitan-Creed*. *2dly*, The Doctors of the Church call it the *Nicen*, *3dly*, The Eighth of the Articles of the Church of *England* calls it the *Nicen*. *4thly*, It is called the *Nicen-Creed* in the Book of *Common Prayer*, particularly in the Martyrdom of King *Charles* I. and in the Reſtoration of King *Charles* II.

The Church of *England* is not poſitive upon the proper Denomination of the three Creeds, that is to ſay, That the Twelve Apoſtles were the Compoſers of the very Words in that Creed; but that what is comprehended therein was Apoſtolick Doctrine: Or that which is called the *Athanaſian-Creed*, was Compoſed by *Athanaſius* himſelf, but by ſome who underſtood and were acquainted with *Athanaſius*'s *Anti-Arian* Principles. And 'tis well known, that the Creed which was compoſed in the Council of *Nice* was enlarged in the Council of *Conſtantinople*; but commonly it goes under the Name of the *Nicen-Creed*, and it is as you would add another Piece of Silver to a Silver Plate, and ſo make the Plate more large. But how in any Senſe it can be called the *Trent-Creed*, as it ſtands in the *Engliſh*-Service, I leave it to the Determination of the Judges of all Parties and Perſwaſions.

Mr. *A*-- p. 8. Falling into his Art of Divination, ſays, *It may be worth the while to enquire, What has led Mr.* Calder, *into thoſe miſtakes about the* Nicen *and* Trent-Creed? *The Matter*, he ſays, *is plainly thus, When Proteſtants diſpute againſt the Papiſts, they never meddle with the Twelve firſt Articles of the* Trent-Creed, *becauſe they are uncontroverted betwixt them, and he has fallen upon ſome ſuch Proteſtant Books, where the Twelve laſt Articles are ſet down, and has from hence concluded there were no more in the Original Draught.*

Mr. *Calder*

Digitized by Google

Mr. *Calder* offers to prove before a Library-Court, That he never had, nor saw any such Protestant Author but what mention'd the *Nicen-Creed* before the *Trent*; and will produce Two Books which he had of his own. *First*, An Anonymous Minister of the Church of *England*, *his necessary Observations upon a Book called, An Essay toward a Proposal for Catholick Communion*, &c. Printed at *London*, 1705.

Another is Dr. *Fowler* Lord Bishop of *Glocester* in the Case of *Symbolizing with Rome*, Where he begins with an Article or Two of the *Nicen-Creed*, and stops with an *&c.* And with these Words, and so on, till the end of the *Nicen-Creed*, and then he fully sets down the Twelve *Tridentine-Articles*, which he calls their own Stuff, all which (saith he) may be seen at the end of the Council of *Trent*. How could Mr. *Calder* be misled by such an Author, especially when he never wants the Council of *Trent* at Hand?

I come now to the point of *Hippolytus* Bishop and Martyr, who Lived in the 220 Year of God, in the Age of Martyrdom and Miracles; and who said, *That the turning out the Reading of Scriptures, and Set-Forms of Prayer out of Churches was a sign of the Antichrist's prevailing in the Christian Church.* And of this *Hippolytus*. Mr. *A*— said, That all the Church of *England* Writers rejected him with one Voice, as an ignorant, fabulous, and foolish Fellow. Mr. *Calder* cited two eminent *English* Divines, which quoted that same Sentence of *Hippolytus* with Approbation. *First*, Dr. *Hammond in his Preface to the Annotations on the Psalms* p. 5. which he took out of *Bibliotheca Patrum*. 2dly, Dr. *Comber*, in his *Preface to his Commentary on the Book of Common-Prayer*, citing that Passage out of S. *Jerom* upon *Daniel*, with Approbation.

Now let the Library-Court of any Perswasion or Party, judge, if Mr. *A*— Answers p. 10. of his Letter, be Honest or Ingenuous. The first Answer is, *Does Dr.* Hammond *pronounce the Book to be genuine? Not he. He was not upon a Dispute with an Adversary; and therefore did not concern himself to enquire, whether it was genuine or spurious.* That is in plain *English*, that the eminently Pious and Learned Dr, *Hammond*, would say, write, or do any thing, true or false, right or wrong, to maintain the Cause he defended. But let the Judicatories I Appeal to, determine, whether or not Dr. *Hammond* look'd upon *Hippolytus* to be genuine.

Again, says Mr. *A*— p. 10. *Does the* Bibliotheca Patrum, *at least from whom* Hammond *cites it, pronounce it to be genuine? No, so far from it, that* Joannes Picus *the Publisher of it cautions the Reader against the Errors, and is plainly of the mind, that it was not the Bishop of* Porta *was the Author of it.*

To which I Answer, That besides the Unreasonableness of so much as thinking, that the Learned *Mirandula* should be at the toil of Translating a spurious Book, and place it with the genuine Writings of other Fathers; yet how can Mr. *A*— make that a Reason, that he look'd not upon the Book as genuine, because he cautions the Reader against the Errours in it? Might not *Picus* do so of *Origen*? Or might not any publish *Tertullian*, *Austin*, or any other *Greek*, or *Latin* Father their genuine Works, and yet caution the Reader against their Erroneous Opinions? S. *Hippolytus* has two Opinions which the Publisher mentions, *to wit*, That St. *John* never Died; and that the *Antichrist* was one that should appear in a Phantastick Body, yet the Publisher looks upon the Work as genuine? And that *Joannes Picus* the Publisher, (as Mr. *A*— says) is plainly of the mind, that the Bishop of *Porta* was not the Author of it, the just contrary shall be proven out of the Publisher's Preface, and the Margin tells that *Hippolytus* was a *Grecian* by Birth, and that he wrote in *Greek*, but was an *Italian* Bishop at *Porta*. This could not escape Mr. *A*—'s Eyes, I refer to the Judicatory, whether or not he deserves to bear the Character of those who are said *to have Eyes and see not*; and to determine, how such a Man should be treated, that imposes so wilfully upon his Reader, or whether or not he should be suspected in all his other Writings as an impudent Impostor?

Again, p. 10. Mr. *A*— Questions thus, "Did the Publisher of it certainly know, at least whether it was Originally "Written in *Greek* or in *Latin*? Not he, *Per me licuit duo sint Hippolyti*, &c. For me let there be two *Hippolytus's*, "one who Wrote in *Greek*, and another who Wrote in *Latin*.

I Answer, That the direct contrary is to be found; for in his Dedication to *Charles* Prince and Cardinal of *Lorrain*, he expresly asserts, "That he was well informed, that S. *Hippolytus* Bishop and Martyr wrote a Treatise upon the "End of the World, the *Antichrist*, and of the Second Coming of Christ. It is Writen in *Greek* and to be had at "*Venice*, and particularly that he was thus informed by S. *Jerom* in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, that S. *Hippolytus* wrote a Treatise concerning the *Antichrist*. Now if he had written in *Latin*, why should *Mirandula* be at the pains to Translate it out of Greek? Besides *Mirandula* never asserted, that the *Latin Hippolytus* wrote any thing at all as Mr. *A*— alledges.

This also Mr. *A*— might, but would not see, nor tell the World, that he did see it: And tho' *Picus* for his part, says, *Let there be two* Hippolytus's, *the one a* Latin, *another a* Grecian; yet he concludes that it was the *Greek Hippolytus* who wrote that Treatise of the *Antichrist*. Let this be Examined by all that have the *Paris* Edition of *Bibliotheca Patrum* p. 343. Printed in the Year 1624.

Again p. 10, and 11. Mr. *A*— proposes another Question thus. *Mr.* Calder's *other Author, is Dr.* Comber, *who* (*says* Calder) *cites the same Words from S.* Jerom *in his Preface to his Book on the Liturgy. Very well, Does Dr.* Comber *vouch the Book to be genuine?* Not he. *Does S.* Jerom *vouch the Book to be genuine? You may see his judgment on* Hippolytus *prefixed to the Book of* Bibliotheca Patrum, *if you find any such thing there, your Eyes are better than mine.* To this I Answer, Whether his Eyes be better than mine or not, I leave it to the Judges to determine; whether my Conscience be better than his, I leave it also to their Decision. *Mirandula* looks on that Work of *Hippolytus* to be genuine, and thought that S. *Jerom* did so too as will be made appear by Reading of *Picus's* Preface. Dr. *Comber* likewise cites that Sentence from S. *Jerom* in his Commentary upon *Daniel*, and that with Approbation.

Again Mr. *A*- p. 11. tells, That S. *Jerom*, gives a Catalogue of S. *Hippolytus's* Works, but not a Word of that Work *De Consummatione Seculi*, out of which that citation is taken, Mr. *A*— might see twice in that Preface to S. *Hippolytus's* Work, First by *Picus*, that S. *Jerom* tells, that *Hippolytus* wrote *De Antichristo*; and also in S. *Jerom's* own Words, S. *Hippolytus* wrote *De Antichristo* whence that Sentence is taken p. 357. of *Bibliotheca Patrum*, 2*d* Tom. *Paris* Edition. Now *De Antichristo*, *De Consummatione Seculi* is all one Treatise, and it is from that Treatise that the Sentence is taken. And now although S. *Jerom* was uncertain, where S. *Hippolytus* was Bishop, in these Words, *Nomen quippe urbis scire non potui*, will that say that he doubted of his Works? For though the Author of the *Whole Duty of Man* be not known, shall we therefore reject the Works as spurious, because we cannot know either the Name nor the Place where he liv'd? Is it not then a sad matter that the World should be thus deluded with palpable Falshoods, and such weak Reasonings?

Mr. *A*— p. 11. In his Letter to a Friend, concludes thus, *Admit the Citation were genuine, it makes nothing against us. It runs thus,* "Liturgy shall be extinguished, the Singing of Psalms shall cease, and the Reciting of Scriptures shall "not be heard. *Now all this* (says Mr, *A*—) *is nothing else but an enlargement upon our Saviour's Words,* That Iniquity shall "abound, and the Love of many shall wax cold.

This indeed is a very rare Exposition; yet I think it will make for the Liturgists, & so the meaning will be, "When "Wickedness overflows like a Deluge, and Love and Charity is frozen and dead; then Schism shall destroy the "Unity of the Church, and Set-Forms of Prayer and the publick Reading of the Scriptures shall be turned out of "Doors.

I have

Digitized by Google

I have many more things to fill up an Indictment against Mr. *A*— but I shall conclude with an Opinion of His in p. 13. *That he will not allow Mr.* Calder *the Name of a Minister.* Surely if Mr. *Anderson* be a Minister, by vertue of his having the Hands of a Presbytry laid upon him, Mr. *Calder* is much more so, having the Hands of a Bishop and Presbyters too, laid upon him. But Mr. *Calder* will not allow Mr. *A*— to be lawfully Ordain'd, because they were not Presbyters that laid their Hands upon him; and albeit they were, yet single Presbyters were never allowed to Ordain without a Bishop. Mr. *Calder* will prove his Ordination from the first Protestant Arch-Bishops and Bishops in *Britain*; and then neither the *Latin* nor *Greek* Church can deny, but he can prove his Ordination upwards to the Days of the Apostles. But let Mr. *A*— and his Adherents prove their Ordination from either *John Calvin* or *John Knox*, who had no more Power to confer Orders, than a Baptized Laick had Power by his Baptism, to Baptize others: And if the Party cannot do this, far less can they prove their Succession from the *Presbytry that laid their Hands on S. Timothy*, suppose they had been single Presbyters; yet the Apostle S. *Paul* was present, who calls it *the laying on of his Hands*, 2 *Tim.* 1 Chap. 6. v. Many Chiefs in *Scotland* are Hundreds of Years older than Presbytry, but they cannot prove by their Charters their Antiquity as old as our Episcopal Ordination.

It was by this Rule that the Primitive Churches guarded themselves against Self-senders, Self-comers, Upstarts and Intruders. See *Tertullian* in his Book of *Prescriptions against Hereticks* 32 Chap. " Let them saith he declare the Original of their Churches, let them turn over or find out the Order of their Bishops, running down by " Succession from the beginning, that this first Bishop of theirs had an Apostle or Apostolick Men, that never sepa- " rated from the Apostles for his Founder, and Predecessor. For after this manner do Apostolick Churches produce " their Accounts, as the Church of *Smyrna* had *Polycarp* placed there by S. *John*, and the Church of *Rome*, *Clemens*, " Ordained by S. *Peter*; even as other Churches can demonstrate, who were Ordained Bishops over them by those " of the Apostolick Succession.

Whether then shall Mr. *A*— go for the Foundation of his Ministry? Not to the Body of the People; for that is Independency: Not to the Magistrate; for that is *Erastianism*: Not to the Call of the Spirit; for that is *Quakerism*: Not to Apostolick Succession; for that is Episcopacy: And it is not in their Power so to derive their Succession. Consequently all their Ministerial Acts are void and null; so that an honest Country-Man's Baptism, or a Midwife's, is as good, yea better than theirs, if they be not Schismaticks from the Church; for they pretend Necessity, but the Presbyterians pretend Authority.

Now the Ordination of Presbyters being proved by the Apostolick Succession of Bishops, and they in Arch-Bishops, Primates, Metropolitanes and Patriarchs. " For, as *Calvin* says in his Epistle to the King of *Poland*, the Ancient " Church did appoint Patriarchs and Primates in every Province, that by this Bond of Concord, the Bishops might the " better be knit together.

I shall therefore prove my Ordination up to Arch-Bishop *Cranmer*, the first Protestant Arch-Bishop in *Britain*.

Mr. *Calder* was Ordained by the Bishop of *Edinburgh*, who was consecrated by Bishop *Sharp*, who was at the King's Restoration Ordained first, Deacon; then, Presbyter; because the Bishops of *England* did not look upon his Presbyterian Ordination as valid; and then was consecrated Bishop. Now in the 1663 Year of God was *Gilbert Sheldon*, Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*; before him was *William Juxon* in 1660. In 1633 was *William Laud*. In 1610 was *George Abbot*. In 1604 was *Richard Bancroft*. In 1583 *John Whitgift*. In 1575 *Edmund Grindal*. In 1559 *Matthew Parker*. In 1555 *Reginald Pool*. In 1533 *Thomas Cranmer*. Hereafter I shall give a List of all their Succession to the Apostles.

Mr. *Calder* in all this Libel has not brought a *railing Accusation* against Mr. *Anderson*, for all his reviling and Scoundrel Language against him; but prays in the Words of an Angel of Light against an Angel of Darkness; *The Lord rebuke thee.* His Lyes, Slanders, and Calumnies, will do Mr. *Calder* as little Harm, as the Viper that leapt on S. *Paul's* Hand.

ADVERTISEMENT,

THese are to give Notice to all Men of Candour and Knowledge, of any Party or Perswasion; who love the Truth, and hate impudent Lyers, and allow that all publick Impostors, and impudent Cheats should be exposed as abominable Monsters to the World, and be chastised with all the just Severities that fraudulent Villains deserve; That Mr. Robert Calder, *Minister of the Gospel, for the present at* Edinburgh, *has Printed a Sheet of Paper against Mr.* John Anderson *the Presbyterian Incumbent at* Dumbarton, *who makes it his Business by Lying, Slandering and Reviling Pamphlets to Discredit the Church of* England, *it's* Clergy *and* Book of Common-Prayer; *and also the* Liturgick Clergy *of* Scotland; *that the said Mr.* Calder *demonstrates from the Pamphlets written by him and Mr.* Anderson, *That the said Mr.* Anderson *is one of the grossest Lyers that ever put Pen to Paper. And for the clear Probation thereof, Mr.* Calder *invites any who please in the City of* Edinburgh, *to his Meeting-House in* Todrigg's-Wynd, *On* Wednesdays *and* Frydays *for three Weeks after the Date hereof, betwixt* 11, *and* 12 *in the Morning, and* 2 *and* 3 *in the Afternoon, that they may see with their Eyes, and hear with their Ears Mr.* Calder's *Indictment against Mr.* Anderson, *proven from the Books which are cited in the Libel; which when proven, is to be sent to all the Universities in the Three Kingdoms, from whence we are to expect the Censure that such a Deceiver deserves.*

Mr. Calder *also hath wagered Twenty Guineas against Mr.* Anderson's *other Twenty, That he neither dare nor can make good a Point, which he confidently undertook to prove, and is mentioned in that Libel.*

Mr. Calder *also, in that Paper against Mr.* Anderson, *who denies Mr.* Calder *to be a Minister, offers to prove the Validity of his Ordination in a Catalogue up to the Apostles; and gives a Defiance to Mr.* Anderson *to prove his in a Lineal Succession of Presbytry from either* John Knox *in* Scotland, *or* John Calvin *in* Geneve, *who had no Power to confer Orders.*

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google